

Sparsa Collecta

The Collected Essays of
W.C. van Unnik

PART FOUR

SUPPLEMENTS TO NOVUM TESTAMENTUM 156

EDITED BY

*Cilliers Breytenbach and
Pieter W. van der Horst*

BRILL

Sparsa Collecta Part Four

Supplements to Novum Testamentum

Executive Editors

M.M. Mitchell (*Chicago*)
D.P. Moessner (*Forth Worth*)

Editorial Board

H.W. Attridge, *New Haven* – C. Breytenbach, *Berlin*
J.K. Elliott, *Leeds* – C.R. Holladay, *Atlanta*
D. Marguerat, *Lausanne* – M.J.J. Menken, *Tilburg*
J.C. Thom, *Stellenbosch* – P. Trebilco, *Dunedin*

VOLUME 156

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/nts*



WILLEM CORNELIS VAN UNNIK

(28th August 1910–17th March 1978)

Sparsa Collecta

The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik
Part Four

NEOTESTAMENTICA – FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS – PATRISTICA

Edited by

Cilliers Breytenbach and Pieter W. van der Horst



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Library of Congress Control Number: 74154706

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual 'Brill' typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0167-9732

ISBN 978 90 04 27122 7 (hardback)

ISBN 978 90 04 27173 9 (e-book)

Copyright 2014 by Koninklijke Brill nv, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill nv incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Global Oriental and Hotei Publishing.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill nv provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Contents

Preface	vii
Acknowledgements	viii
Willem Cornelis van Unnik (1910–1978)	x

Neotestamentica 1

The Death of Judas in Saint Matthew's Gospel	3
Translation versus the Dictionary—Mark 8:33 // Matthew 16:23	17
The Phrase ταῦτα εἰπὼν in the Gospel According to John	28
The Interpretation of Romans 12:8: ὁ μεταδιδούς ἐν ἀπλότητι	42
Lob und Strafe durch die Obrigkeit. Hellenistisches zu Röm. 13,3–4	57

Flavius Josephus 67

Flavius Josephus als historischer Schriftsteller	69
Eine merkwürdige liturgische Aussage bei Josephus	129
Josephus' Account of the Story of Israel's Sin with Alien Women in the Country of Midian (Num. 25:1 ff.)	137
The Divine Predicate "The Beginning and the End" in Flavius Josephus and the Apocalypse of John	158

Patristica 237

Studies on the So-Called First Epistle of Clement. The Literary Genre	239
An Interesting Document of Second Century Theological Discussion (Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. 1.10.3)	306
The Authority of the Presbyters in Irenaeus' Works	336
Two Notes on Irenaeus	351
Irenaeus and the Pax Romana	363
Index of Modern Authors	377
Index of Ancient Literature	381
Index of Subjects	394

Preface

This volume completes the volumes of collected essays by Willem C. van Unnik. The first three volumes appeared between 1970–1983 under the title *Sparsa Collecta* in “Novum Testamentum Supplements.” All the essays in those volumes had been published between 1930 and 1970.

The essays in this collection are not that well known. Several of them appeared in *Festschriften* for Dutch colleagues. The editors of the present volume thus decided to publish a fourth volume with a selection of van Unnik's papers published between 1974 and 1978. We also include three longer studies: His 1972 “Franz Delitzsch Vorlesungen” (published posthumously 1978) and two submissions to the Royal Dutch Academy on the literary genre of 1st Clement (1970) and the divine predicate “The Beginning and the End” in Josephus and the Apocalypse (1976). With the exception of the study on 1st Clement, the other essays originally published in Dutch appear here for the first time in English.

Pieter van den Horst carefully corrected the translations made into English and wrote a short Biogram on Van Unnik. We thank the editors of the supplement series, Margaret M. Mitchell and David Moesner, for following our suggestion to complete the publication of the collected essays in *NovTSup* and Dr. Anja Sakowski for assisting us in preparing the manuscript. The indices were made by Dr. Mark Grundeken and Elina Bernitt in Berlin. We thank them and Mattie Kuiper and Maaïke Langerak of Brill for their collaboration.

Cilliers Breytenbach

Berlin

Pieter van der Horst

Utrecht

17th March 2014

Acknowledgements

"The Death of Judas in Saint Matthew's Gospel." In: *Gospel Studies in Honour of Sherman Elbridge Johnson* (eds. M.H. Shepherd and E.C. Hobbs; Anglican Theological Review, supplementary series 3, 1974), 44–57

*"Translation versus the Dictionary—Mark 8:33 // Matthew 16:23." In: *Van taal tot taal: opstellen over het vertalen van de Schriften aangeboden aan prof. dr. W.K. Grossouw bij diens afscheid van de Nijmeegse Universiteit* (Annalen van het Thijmgenootschap, 65/3; eds. M. de Jonge, B.M.F. van Iersel; C. Brekelmans and J. Nelis; Baarn: Ambo, 1977), 51–61

*"The Phrase ταῦτα εἰπὼν in the Gospel According to John." In: *Ad Interim: opstellen over eschatologie, apocalyptiek en ethiek aangeboden aan prof. dr. R. Schippers t.g.v. zijn vijf en twintig-jarig ambtsjubileum als hoogleraar aan de Faculteit der godgeleerdheid van de Vrije Universiteit* (Kampen: Kok, 1975), 61–75

"The Interpretation of Romans 12:8: ὁ μεταδίδους ἐν ἀπλότητι." In: *On Language, Culture and Religion: in Honour of Eugene A. Nida* (Approaches to Semiotics 56; eds. M. Black and W. A. Smalley; The Hague: Mouton, 1974), 169–183

"Lob und Strafe durch die Obrigkeit: Hellenistisches zu Röm. 13, 3–4." In: *Jesus und Paulus: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70. Geburtstag* (eds. E.E. Ellis and E. Gräßer; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 334–343

Flavius Josephus als historischer Schriftsteller (Heidelberg: Schneider, 1978)

"Eine merkwürdige liturgische Aussage bei Josephus, *Jos Ant* 8, 111–113." In: *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament. Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet* (eds. O. Betz, K. Haacker and M. Hengel; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 362–369

"Josephus' Account of the Story of Israel's Sin with Alien Women in the Country of Midian (Num. 25:1 ff.)." In: *Travels in the world of the Old Testament: Studies Presented to M.A. Beek on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 16; ed. M.S. H.G. Heerma van Voss; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1974), 241–261

**The Divine Predicate "The Beginning and the End" in Flavius Josephus and the Apocalypse of John* (Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen,

afd. Letterkunde Nieuwe Reeks 39, no. 1; Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandse Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1976)

“Studies on the So-Called First Epistle of Clement. The Literary Genre.” In *Encounters with Hellenism: Studies on the First Letter of Clement* (AGJU 53; eds. C. Breytenbach and L. Welborn; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 115–181. Originally: *Studies over de zogenaamde eerste brief van Clemens: I. Het literaire genre* (Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde Nieuwe Reeks 33, no. 4; Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1970)

“An Interesting Document of Second Century Theological Discussion (Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. 1.10.3).” In: *Vigiliae Christianae* 31 (1977), 196–228

“The Authority of the Presbyters in Irenaeus’ Works.” In: *God’s Christ and His People: Studies in Honour of Nils Alstrup Dahl* (ed. J. Jervell; Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1977), 248–260

“Two Notes on Irenaeus (I. Irenaeus and Atticus Platonicus, II. Irenaeus on Clemens Romanus).” In: *Vigiliae Christianae*, 30 (1976), 201–213

*“Irenaeus and the Pax Romana.” In: *Kerk en vrede: opstellen aangeboden aan prof. dr. J. de Graaf* (ed. G. Casalis; Baarn: Ten Have, 1978), 207–222

* Translated from the Dutch by David Orton

Willem Cornelis van Unnik (1910–1978)

Willem Cornelis van Unnik, a Dutch Protestant professor of New Testament studies, was one of the first scholars in the Netherlands in the period after World War II to emphasize the great importance of a thorough first-hand knowledge of both the Jewish and the Graeco-Roman worlds in which Christianity came into being as a Jewish movement and developed into the dominant religion of the Later Roman Empire. He was born in 1910 in the city of Haarlem as a son to Cornelis van Unnik and Maria Comijs. After his high school period at the Municipal Gymnasium of Haarlem, where he also followed optional lessons in biblical Hebrew with rabbi S.Ph. de Vries, he became a student of theology at Leiden University, where he underwent the influence of not only the NT scholar J. de Zwaan, but also of the Semitist A.J. Wensinck (who taught him Syriac and Arabic), and of the classical philologists B.A. van Groningen and J.H. Thiel. As a student of only 20 years he published his first scholarly article in *ZNW* 29 (1930), in which he used materials from classical Greek sources for the elucidation of a problem in the NT, which was to remain a characteristic of many of his later publications as a mature scholar. He spent the year 1932/33 at the Quaker College 'Woodbrooke' in Birmingham as a student of J. Rendel Harris and A. Mingana. He received his master's degree *cum laude* in 1934 and immediately started to work on a dissertation in which he published, translated and extensively commented upon a Syriac manuscript from Mingana's collection in Woodbrooke. The work was entitled *Nestorian Questions on the Administration of the Eucharist by Isho'yabh IV. A Contribution to the History of the Eucharist in the Eastern Church* (1937). For this book he received in 1946 the Mallinckrodt-prize, a reward for the best theological dissertation in the past decade.

From 1936–1938 he was assistant minister of the Orthodox Reformed community in the village of Enkhuizen; in 1938 he became minister of the Reformed Church in the nearby village of Opperdoes. In addition to that function, since 1939 he was also a lecturer in Early Christian literature at Leiden University. In April 1940 the University of Pretoria (South Africa) offered him a chair for NT studies, but the German occupation of the Netherlands less than a month later made his acceptance of this offer impossible. In 1942 he became a teacher of religion at a highschool in the city of The Hague, where he met his later wife, Sophie Niemantsverdriet; they married during the war but remained childless. In 1945 he accepted a position as a Reformed minister in the city of Schiedam, but as soon as 1946 he was appointed full professor for the study of the NT and Early Christian literature at the Theological Faculty of Utrecht University (as the successor to A.M. Brouwer), a position he held until his sudden death in 1978.

In the 32 years of his professorship in Utrecht, Van Unnik gained great fame both in the Netherlands and abroad. He received four honorary doctorates: from the universities of Münster (1961), St. Andrews (1961), Oslo (1965) and Strassbourg (1970); at the

age of 40 he was appointed a member of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW); he was elected as president of the Netherlands Organisation for the Advancement of Pure Research (ZWO); also as president of the Dutch Bible Society (NBG); as member of the Kirchenväterkommission der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin; as member of the board of the Dutch Christian Broadcasting Society (NCRV); as Rector magnificus (and later Prorector) of Utrecht University; as President of the international Society of New Testament Studies (SNTS), etc. All these functions were offered him because he was a scholar of great stature with an impressive publication record on a wide variety of subjects: the NT, ancient Judaism, Hellenistic-Roman culture, early Christian literature, Gnosticism, Oriental church history etc. His bibliography has more than 200 titles. His impressively wide reading, his great knowledge of various ancient languages, and his enormous energy made him into one of the most erudite and prolific Dutch theologians of the post-World War II period. Sixteen theologians wrote their dissertations under his guidance. For many years he headed the editorial teams of two international journals, *Novum Testamentum* and *Vigiliae Christianae*.

Apart from his many activities and publications, Van Unnik became an internationally well-known scholar especially by his efforts, in the middle of the fifties, to revive the *Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti*, a project that had been initiated in 1913 by the German NT scholars Georg Heinrici and Ernst von Dobschütz, but that had petered out during the Nazi period. The aim of this project was to shed new light on problems of NT interpretation by an intensive search for comparative materials ('parallels') in ancient Greek and Latin authors. In order to further that purpose Van Unnik appointed specialized researchers and he initiated the series *Studia ad Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti* with Brill's publishing house. Van Unnik himself wrote many contributions to the project in which he demonstrated that it is often only with a profound knowledge of and familiarity with the primary sources of Greek and Roman culture that one is able to decode the secrets of a NT text or the interpretive problems of an early Christian document. For instance, in his famous study *Tarsus or Jerusalem: The City of Paul's Youth* (1952) he argues that Paul moved from Tarsus, where he was born, to Jerusalem already in his early childhood, not as an adult man, on the basis of a thorough examination of the use of the verbs *anatrephein* (to nurture) and *paid-euein* (to bring up) in Greek literature (see Acts 22:3). And his discovery of the political meaning of *mia gnômê* (one mind) in Greek literature (1970) shed new light on the extraordinary nature of the unanimity of the kings in their war against the Lamb of God in Rev. 17:13.

Even though this research project mainly focused on pagan sources in their relevance for the study of the NT, during his entire academic career Van Unnik stressed the great importance of the study of ancient Judaism as an indispensable prerequisite for understanding the message of Jesus and the NT authors (he did so already in his

inaugural address in 1947). His interest and love for Judaism is apparent in a steady stream of publications on a wide variety of aspects of early Jewish culture (also his very last book, published 15 years after his death [1993], on the way Jews experienced life in a diaspora situation in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, dealt with a Jewish topic). Van Unnik always inculcated his students that, after his birth, Jesus had not been carried around the hearth (as the Romans did) but had been circumcised as a Jewish boy, and that this has far-reaching implications for the way one approaches the books of the NT and other early Christian literature. Well-known, for instance, are his studies on the Semitic background of *parrhêsia* (freedom of speech) in the NT (1962) and on the Jewish components in the origins of Gnosticism (1961). It was this balance between a ‘Hellenistic’ and a ‘Jewish’ approach to the NT and early Christianity that characterized his academic work, and in this respect he was a pioneer in the Netherlands in the first decades after World War II.

An essay published by Van Unnik in 1971 bears the title “Words Come to Life.” It was his strong conviction that the words of the NT can only come to life if we do our utmost to hear and read these words with the eyes and ears of someone from the first century. We have to try hard to get within the horizon of understanding of Jews and Gentiles in the early Christian period if ever we want to do justice to the semantic nuances of the words and phrases that meet us on the pages of the NT and other early Christian documents that were written by Jews and Gentiles who had become Christians but retained their former ways of expression. Van Unnik’s method to reach that goal was simply to read as much ancient literature as possible, both pagan, Jewish, and Christian, and digest its contents so as to gradually build up the capacity to ‘listen with first-century ears’ (as he used to put it). Although Van Unnik always had an aversion to methodological debates, his own implicit methodology was simply this ongoing attempt to ‘listen with first-century ears,’ an ability that he thought—perhaps a bit naively—could be achieved by continuous exposure to all aspects of first-century civilization, both Jewish and Greco-Roman.

Van Unnik’s significance is that he made many students and colleagues aware of the fact that the NT is not a *diopetes* (something fallen from heaven; see Acts 19:35), and that as human document it has to be interpreted in the context of its time. Only a thorough familiarity with ancient Jewish and pagan culture in all its aspects can prevent us from projecting our own ideas upon the sacred text. It is exactly the respect we owe to this text that should lead us to a thorough study of the world in which it came into being. By the beginning of the 21st century this may sound like a truism, but in Van Unnik’s time he still had to fight against the theological prejudice that spending energy on the study of Greco-Roman and Jewish antiquity was a waste of time. He proved the contrary to be true.

Between 1973 and 1983 three volumes of collected essays by Van Unnik appeared under the title *Sparsa Collecta*. All the essays in these volumes had been published between 1930 and 1970. The editors of the present volume decided to publish a fourth volume with a selection of his later papers, some of which appear here for the first time in English (they were originally published in Dutch).

The most complete bibliography of Van Unnik's works is in Pieter W. van der Horst, "Bibliographie von W.C. van Unnik," in: W.C. van Unnik, *Das Selbstverständnis der jüdischen Diaspora in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit*, aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben und bearbeitet von P.W. van der Horst (Leiden: Brill, 1993) 29–50.

Pieter van der Horst

Neotestamentica



The Death of Judas in Saint Matthew's Gospel

It is something of a paradox to make a contribution to a *Festschrift* by discussing so gloomy a subject as the death of someone, the more so since this book honors a faithful, steady friend, whereas my theme deals with that most mysterious of Jesus' disciples whose name became proverbial for a traitor. But deep friendship, strengthened through a shared experience in "the joy of study," does not shun paradoxes, for they have a stimulating effect. And so I offer this paper to Dr. Sherman Johnson as a token of gratitude for his warm friendship which we felt under the dark skies of Utrecht and in the bright sunshine of Berkeley.¹

One of the main centers of the Dean's scholarly interest lies in the Gospels. Since it was he who wrote the exegesis of St. Matthew's Gospel in *The Interpreter's Bible*, it seemed appropriate to devote this contribution to a theme taken from that part of the New Testament. The study of History, the Dutch historian Peter Geyl has taught us, is an ongoing, never-ending debate.² This statement is also true for the study of the Bible. Hence my friend will accept my communication as part of our conversation on one of the most intriguing passages of St. Matthew, namely, the death of Judas (27:3–10).

1 [Editors' note: The manuscript of Professor van Unnik's essay cites most of the Old Testament (LXX) and New Testament texts in Greek. In the interests of both simplicity and economy, we have translated these into English: 1) in the case of the LXX, freshly into English in such a way as to bring out his point, if possible, and 2) in the case of the New Testament, roughly in conformity with the Revised Standard Version, but likewise so as to bring out his point where necessary. Where matters hinge on a particular word, it has been also presented in its Greek form. He also cites Josephus in Greek, which we have translated into English—again so as to bring out his point, if possible. His citations of non-English scholars in the original languages have been translated into English. Where his manuscript cites works in their original (non-English) form, and an English translation exists, we have cited the translation and page references in the English edition rather than in the original editions.

Citations from the LXX sometimes differ from the Hebrew and English in chapter and verse numbers or in book title. Since we have translated the LXX citations in his essay, we have given references by the customary English titles (*e.g.*, II Sam. rather than II Regn., II Kings rather than IV Regn., etc.) and with chapter and verse references to the English translations. However, where LXX numeration is different from the Hebrew (and English), we have given both—with LXX marked thus, and the Hebrew/English marked "MT" for the Masoretic Text.]

2 The title of the preliminary chapter, "Argument Without End," *Napoleon, For and Against* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949).

There are, as is well-known, various and differing accounts of the way in which Judas met his end.³ It is not my intention to discuss these conflicting statements, but to concentrate on one of them. For a comparison between the oldest traditions in Matthew 27:3–10, Acts 1:16–20, and Papias, Fragment 3, we may refer to the fine study by Père Benoit,⁴ which is, to the best of my knowledge, the latest full-scale discussion of that topic. It is clear that all three accounts stem from different traditions and hence it is permissible to pay full attention to one of them to the exclusion of the others.

The text that is relevant for our purpose reads as follows:

3 When Judas, who betrayed him, saw that he was condemned, he changed his mind and brought back the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders, 4 saying, "I have sinned by betraying innocent blood." But they said, "What is that to us? See to it yourself!" 5 And throwing down the pieces of silver in the temple, he left; and he went away and hanged himself.

This description of the way that led Judas to commit suicide has often given rise to all sorts of psychological explanations. According to Wrede, this account of St. Matthew "could express a certain gripping psychological truth to the credit [of Judas]... The reader experiences something like sympathy for the man whose deed is indeed irrevocable, but whose soul is still capable of a nobler impulse."⁵ And though Wrede rejected this view and took the whole scene as an adaptation of Old Testament studies, others were not loath to uphold it. Let me quote just a few comments in that vein.

The great Roman Catholic expositor of a former generation, Père Lagrange, wrote:

Perhaps the beginning of Judas' repentance might have resulted in his penitence, had he been received with charity... He had betrayed the trust of his Master; it is towards him that he was to turn, and not towards

3 In the New Testament, Matt. 27:3–10, and Acts 1:16–20; Papias, Fragment 3, as preserved by Apollinaris; see also the succinct survey about Judas by W. Bauer in *New Testament Apocrypha*, edited by E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher, translated by R. McL. Wilson and others (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963 and 1965), Vol. 2, pp. 62–64.

4 P. Benoit, *Exégèse et Théologie* (Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 1961), pp. 340–359.

5 W. Wrede, "Judas Ischarioth in der urchristlichen Ueberlieferung," *Vorträge und Studien* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1907), p. 141.

the Sanhedrin members: cruelly disappointed in his faith in the leaders of the people, he despaired also of God.⁶

In Adolph Schlatter's extensive commentary on the First Gospel, with his many personal and acute observations, we read:

The call which Judas had received from Jesus became effective in the fact that he perceived his deed as guilt to which he succumbed. . . . Judas did not find the way back to faith in Jesus' sovereign claim. . . . But the recollection of the truth and purity of Jesus arose in Judas once more. . . . Since in the case of Judas the Jewish judge refused to expiate his guilt, he executed the sentence of death on himself.⁷

Or, to cite an American scholar of distinction, Filson gives this comment: Judas "repented (changed his mind) in anguish and remorse. He feels no such loyalty as to go and ask Jesus for forgiveness, but he cannot justify his act and live with himself."⁸ And to add just one more quotation, from the expository notes in *The Interpreter's Bible* by G.A. Buttrick: "What a pity that Judas made his confession to his fellow-conspirators! The story would have had a still somber but perhaps a noble ending if Judas had confessed to his fellow-disciples . . . and to God."⁹

A much longer list of similar notes could easily be compiled, but these may suffice for the moment, since they give a fair representation of the reactions provided by these verses of the First Evangelist. Are they just reflections on what Matthew wrote or an exposition of his story? I cannot help feeling that much of what is said in this way goes "beyond what is written" (I Corinthians 4:6). It is a matter of course that the exegete has sometimes to give a more or less extensive paraphrase in order to bring out the connotations that went with a given word in antiquity and that are different or missing in our languages. It may be that the connection between various verses is not fully expressed and that the author's presupposition, even of a psychological nature, must be brought to the fore. At a certain stage of New Testament exposition, psychological exegesis was very much in vogue (in the early part of this century). Then a reaction set in about 1930, and psychology was banned from the exegetical workshop,

6 M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Matthieu* (7th ed.; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1948), p. 514.

7 *Der Evangelist Matthäus* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1929), p. 768.

8 F.V. Filson, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew* (New York: Harper, 1960), p. 287.

9 "The Gospel according to St. Matthew, Exposition," *The Interpreter's Bible*, VII (Nashville: New York: Abingdon Press, 1951), p. 592.

which was rather odd, because we have to do with authors who are human beings (and not theological robots!), and who often describe human acts and reactions. I for one have no difficulty in applying a certain amount of psychology in exegesis, but then it should be psychological considerations which are in accordance with the views held in the time of the author we are explaining, and not derived from our present time.¹⁰

I

The first pivotal word in this pericope is μεταμελήθεις (*metamelētheis*, “changed his mind”). It has been correctly observed that this is not the same as μετανοεῖν (*metanoein*, “repent”).¹¹ To understand the meaning it had for St. Matthew we may compare the two other instances in which he uses the verb, namely, 21:29 and 32, both peculiar to the First Gospel. In the former, it is used of the son who declared he would not obey the command of his father, but after a while did it (“I will not [sc. work in the vineyard],” but afterward he changed his mind [*metamelētheis*] and went). What motive he had remains in darkness; whether he found it wiser or more expedient, or was compelled by love for his father, is not stated. The simple fact that he went, “having changed his mind” (*metamelētheis*) is noted; and this parable is not told to give a moving story, but to elicit a judgment from the hearers (cf. the questions in verses 28 and 31). Therefore the proper translation cannot go any further than to say: “he changed his mind.” As the conclusion drawn from this parable stands the second text (21:32). Remarkable is the threefold use of the verb “believe” (*pisteuein*) and the echo of verse 30 in the words, “did you change your mind afterward”; hence the negative “not” means a climax: “not even then.” One would have expected that the people addressed by Jesus, in seeing that the harlots and tax-gatherers came to believe in John, would have changed their mind and likewise have

10 Reminding ourselves that there is not a standard psychology for all times, but that different cultures have different psychologies.

11 O. Michel, μεταμέλομαι, ἀμεταμέλητος, in G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, translated by G.W. Bromiley, IV (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967), p. 626. In this connection, Paul’s statement in II Cor. 7:8–10 is often quoted:

“For even if I made you sorry with my letter, I do not regret it (*metamelomai*), even if I did regret it (*metemelomēn*). For I see that that letter grieved you, though only for a while. As it is, I rejoice, not because you were grieved, but because you were grieved to repentance (*metanoian*); for you felt a godly grief, so that you suffered no loss through us. For godly grief produces a repentance (*metanoian*) that leads to salvation and brings no regret (*ametamelēton*), but worldly grief produces death.”

accepted the Baptist's preaching. In this pericope, the word "to change one's mind" (*metamelesthai*) is the keyword. The context clarifies its meaning: first one did a thing, later one decided to do something else, which of course for some reason or another one thought was the better course. And in that way it may imply the notion of "regret."

This is important with regard to the passage we are considering. The words, "he brought back the thirty pieces of silver," refer back to the agreement made by Judas with the chief priests and elders, as told in 26:14–16. In Matthew's version of this betrayal, as compared with those of the other Gospels, it is striking that the role of the money and Judas' activity to get it are so prominent. He asks, "What will you give me?" and then follows what he is willing to do in return. That is missing in Mark and Luke, where the betrayal is immediately mentioned as Judas' purpose, while the chief priests then in their joy over this (unexpected?) help promise a certain, undefined sum of money ("they promised/engaged to give him money"). Matthew has them give the money at once. In the First Gospel this point of the price is of great importance; and, though it is not said or even suggested as in St. John that Judas was a thief,¹² it is he who asks for the money. That was his first action. Now, in our text, he "changed his mind" (*metamelētheis*)—here again after "when he saw" (*idōn*) as in 21:32, "when they saw" (*idontes*)—and does his second deed of returning the money. It is, so to say, on the spur of the moment ("then," *tote*) that he changes his mind.

Even if the notion of regret is implied, it is not emphasized, for Matthew uses the participle of the verb and not the finite form. The asyndetic connection of the participles, "having seen . . . having changed his mind" (*idōn . . . metamelētheis*), indicates the successive steps that lead to the real action: "he brought back the thirty pieces of silver." So far it is completely in line with the use of this verb in Matthew 21, and the idea of his regret is not stressed. In the text itself, there is no reason to speculate on the inner movements of Judas' soul. What is highlighted by St. Matthew, however, are the words expressed in verse 4: "I have sinned by betraying innocent blood." They bring in a completely new element and quite unexpectedly show that much more is at stake than just returning the money. To this we shall come presently. First, we must deal with the final act of Judas: "he went away and hanged himself."

12 John 12:6, where, however, this information is not immediately linked up with the betrayal.

II

The way in which Judas put an end to his life has always filled Christian readers with horror. It has often been used as an illustration of St. Paul's words in II Corinthians 7:10: "But the sorrow of the world brings about death."¹³ The verb ἀπαγγω (*apanchō*, "hang oneself") is used only twice in the LXX, namely, II Samuel 17:23 and Tobit 3:10, in its middle or passive form—"to strangle oneself by hanging."¹⁴ The occurrence in Tobit is hardly relevant, because Sarah is only contemplating this escape from the scoffing of her servants who accuse her of killing her successive severe husbands; but she does not execute this plan, since she thinks it more useful to pray to God (*sic!*).¹⁵ But the other text, describing the suicide of Ahithophel, seems much more profitable. Practically all modern commentators¹⁶ see this story in II Samuel 17:23 either as a model or even as the source of St. Matthew's account. The latter course is followed, for example, by Lohmeyer, notwithstanding his own remark that the differences are as great as the agreements between the two stories.¹⁷ Let us see what light this Old Testament passage may give.

We are told that Ahithophel was a counselor of David (II Samuel 15:12; I Chronicles 27:33 f.). His opinion carried great weight and was valued as an oracle (II Samuel 16:23). When Absalom revolted against his father, Ahithophel joined the rebellious forces (II Samuel 15:12; 16:15 ff.), and at the request of Absalom gave advice about the way in which this prince might show that he had taken over and was in full possession of the government (namely, by taking the harem of his father). But this line of action was frustrated by the intervention of David's spy, Hushai (II Samuel 17:5 ff.). Finally the good advice (II Samuel 17:14) of Ahithophel is not followed: "And Ahithophel saw that his advice was not followed, and he saddled his donkey and arose and departed to his home, to his city; and he gave orders to his household, and hanged himself (*apēnxato*) and died, and he was buried in the tomb of his father" (II Samuel 17:23).

13 E.g., by J. Schniewind, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (4th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1950), p. 268.

14 H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (9th ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), p. 174.

15 At least according to the text of Codex Sinaiticus of Tobit 3:10: "It is better for me not to hang myself, but rather to ask the Lord that I might die and no longer hear insults in my life." (The text in Vaticanus and Alexandrinus is quite different.)

16 E.g., W. Wrede, A.H. McNeile, E. Klostermann, P. Bonnard.

17 E. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*, ed. by W. Schmauch (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956), p. 375.

It is interesting to read here also the paraphrase of Josephus, *Antiquities* VII. 9, 8, sec. 228 f.:

Now Ahithophel, his opinion having failed to be accepted, mounted his animal and set off for Gelmon, his hometown. And when he had summoned all of his people, he told them what he had advised Absalom, and that since it was not accepted he was plainly going to perish not long after; for David, he said, would conquer and be restored to his kingdom. Therefore, he said, it was better for him to withdraw himself from life freely and high-mindedly,¹⁸ than to surrender himself to David's retribution for all his aid to Absalom against him. Having said this, he entered the innermost part of the house and hanged himself. Ahithophel, as his own judge, sentenced himself to such a death,¹⁹ and his relatives cut him down from the rope and buried him.

The Jewish historian brings most clearly to the fore what is implied in the original text, namely, that the rejection of his advice and the consequences that would have followed, brought him to commit suicide.²⁰ He also interprets the word *apēnxato* as "he hanged himself."

Now, what does the "parallelism" between II Samuel 17:23 and Matthew 27:5 amount to? To nothing more than *apēlthen* / *apelthōn* ("he departed / having departed"—which can hardly be called significant!) and *apēnxato* ("he hanged himself"). But there is no word, not even a hint, that Ahithophel had betrayed David (which was, of course, the actual case, but which is an inference we draw), whereas in St. Matthew the word *paradous* ("betraying") is used twice (verses 3, 4). Ahithophel's motive lies in the rejection of his advice (and his fear for the consequences), but does not speak of any feeling of guilt, whereas Judas says, "I have sinned by betraying innocent blood."

The whole parallelism dwindles down to a single word.²¹ Now it is evident that early Christians could use the Old Testament in a queer way; the

18 A typically Stoic conception; see M. Pohlenz, *Die Stoa, Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1948–1949), Vol. I, pp. 158, 323, with the references in Vol. II, pp. 84, 160.

19 This is Josephus' own judgment on suicide; cf. his long discourse against suicide in *War* III. 8, A, 5, sec. 361 ff., and A. Schlatter, *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josephus* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1932), pp. 160 f.

20 E.R. Dalglish, "Ahithophel," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (Nashville-New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), I, 71.

21 Namely, *apēnxato*. The words, "he left" (*anechōrēsen*, Matt. 27:5) and "he departed" (*apēlthon*) to his home," (II Sam. 17:23) can hardly be called a parallel.

very sequence of our passage brings a witness to that quotation of Jeremiah (Zechariah). But in that case the verbal correspondence is much stronger, and the Evangelist himself calls attention to the “fulfillment.” But with this *apēnxato* there is nothing of that sort. If these two texts from II Samuel 17:23 and Matthew 27:5 were the only ones in ancient literature where this verb is found, something might be said in favor of such a close connection. But Ahithophel and Judas, though exceptions in Israel, were not the only persons in antiquity who hanged themselves. I fail to see any light coming from that Old Testament story to illuminate the gloomy end of Jesus’ disciple; on the contrary, till further notice it is sheer prejudice to derive this detail of the Judas story from the Old Testament.

But is it possible to see what brought Judas to his deed? Was it despair? Here, as in other texts of the New Testament, the authors do not describe the feelings of the actors in the drama. Matthew did, however, record Judas’ own declaration. That leads us to the question whether that may give us a clue.

III

The declaration of Judas that accompanies his return of the money, “I have sinned by betraying innocent blood,” has an Old Testament background. That fact is generally acknowledged. To the best of my knowledge, the combination “innocent blood” is only found in the Biblical sphere and even there, outside the Old Testament, not very often.²² But is it sufficient to mention this background with some references without further comment? Lohmeyer made the remark that “to shed innocent blood” was “one of the worst sins which earlier Israelite kings committed.”²³ But one may ask, in what sense this is relevant for the present passage. For I cannot see the grounds for the following statement: “The burden of this statement is therefore that it charges the judges with this gravest offense against God’s commandment, not that it gives evidence of an inner transformation of Judas.” One wonders why in this way the judges are laid under a charge, for according to them Jesus was guilty (Matthew 26:65 f.); and how is it possible to state that the weight of this verse is directed against the Sanhedrin and not say something about Judas?²⁴

22 Once in Philo, *De Spec. Leg.* I. 5, 204; once or twice in *Test. XII Patr.*: *Test. Zeb.* 2:2 and *Test. Levi* 16:3 (a Christian interpolation according to R.H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* [Oxford: University Press, 1908], p. 59).

23 Lohmeyer, *op. cit.*, p. 376 and p. 375, n. 3.

24 Of course, it may be asked what exactly is meant by “an inner transformation.”

In passing, we may note that the expression “innocent blood” is not used in a general sense, as we may say that in an air raid innocent women and children are killed. It is used in a specific sense of people who have not committed any crime, living within the holy nation of Israel.

All texts of the LXX which use the expression show that it was considered a most horrible crime.²⁵ But some of them are particularly interesting, because they make us see what are the effects of this deed. God's revenge is against a person who sheds blood; cf. Genesis 9:6: “Whoever sheds a man's blood, in exchange for his blood shall [his own blood] be shed, for he made man in God's image” (where one may ask, whether this passive form is not a *passivum divinum*),²⁶ for “the life is in the blood” (Leviticus 17:11). Jeremiah warns his contemporaries that if they kill him, the true messenger of God, “you bring innocent blood on yourselves²⁷ and on this city and on its inhabitants” (33:15 LXX; 26:15 in MT and English texts), and that means the destruction under God's curse.

This consequence is clearly expressed in II Kings 24:2 ff.: the Lord sends the Babylonians and their allies in Judah “to win a victory (*katischusai*). . . Nevertheless for the Lord's wrath he was in Judah, to withdraw it from his presence” because of the many sins of Manasseh. “And also he shed innocent blood, and he filled Jerusalem with innocent blood; and the Lord was not willing to be propitiated.”²⁸ In the list of grave sins which Israel committed by idolatry and the offering of children it is said: “and they shed innocent blood” (Psalm 105:38 LXX = 106:38 MT), followed by the words: “and the land was polluted with their blood, and was defiled with their deeds . . . and the Lord was angered with wrath against his people and he abhorred his inheritance, and he handed them over into the hands of the nations,” etc. (Psalm 105:38–41 LXX = 106:38–41 MT). Here we draw special attention to this element of “uncleanness” and “pollution,” followed by the wrath of the Lord.²⁹ In this respect the words

25 Other texts with the expression “innocent blood” besides those mentioned in our discussion are I Sam. 19:5; I Kings 2:5; Esther 8:12 e (in LXX Apocryphal additions to Esther—in KJV Apocrypha this verse is numbered 16:5); II Macc. 1:8; Jer. 7:6 (in LXX = 22:3 in MT and English); 19:4; 22:17; Ps. 93:21 (in LXX = 94:21 in MT and English).

26 H.L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1922), Vol. I, p. 443; J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology: The Proclamation of Jesus* (New York: Scribner's, 1971), pp. 9–14.

27 Cf. Matt. 27:25: “All the people said, ‘His blood be upon us and upon our children.’”

28 Cf. II Kings 21:16: “And Manasseh shed very much innocent blood.” See also II Chron. 36:5 d (LXX; not in MT or English).

29 See I Macc. 1:37: the occupiers of Jerusalem “shed innocent blood around the sanctuary and defiled the sanctuary.” Jer. 2:33–34: “You have acted wickedly by defiling your ways, and on your hands was found the blood of innocent lives.”

of Abigail in I Samuel 25 are particularly interesting. When David has not killed Nabal, who has injured him so severely, she says: “the Lord prevented you from spilling innocent blood and rescued your hand for you” (verse 26), and somewhat later: “this will not be an abomination and a stumbling-block for you, my lord, to have shed innocent blood without reason” (verse 31), when David has become king of Israel.

These declarations are most illuminating, if we remember the great weight carried by the words “abomination” (*bdelugmos*) and “stumbling-block” (*skandalon*).³⁰ The paraphrase of Josephus (*Antiquities* VI. 13, 7, sec. 303) gives us an insight into the way the contemporaries of the New Testament authors looked at it: [thank God] “who has prevented you from defiling yourself with human blood. For in your remaining clean, he himself will avenge [you] against the wicked.”

This shedding of innocent blood makes a man “unclean” and will bring terrible destruction.³¹ As is well-known, this “pollution” makes a man unfit to live in the presence of God, to be a member of the holy nation.

Hence it can be easily understood why in I Samuel 19:5 Jonathan gives the strong warning to his father, that to kill David without reason would mean to “sin against innocent blood”—(“Why would you sin against innocent blood by killing David without reason?”) It is implied here that “sin against innocent blood” is a very grave sin. In the light of the preceding texts, its depth will be somewhat fathomed. For our present theme it is important to notice the express mention of “to sin” (*hamartanein*).

But so far we have left undiscussed the text that is most relevant for the understanding of the scene in Matthew. It is sometimes referred to, but without the complete wording. In a long list of grave sins over which a curse is uttered in Deuteronomy 27:15 ff. we read (verse 25): “Cursed be whoever takes gifts [bribes] to take the life of innocent blood [to kill an innocent person].”³² Here the punishment is pronounced over people who receive bribes³³ to bring “innocent blood” to death, and it is a curse. In a solemn response all the people

30 Cf. Kittel and Friedrich, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 598–600 (βδελύσσομαι); and Vol. VII, pp. 339–358 (σκάνδαλον).

31 Parallel to αἷμα ἁθῶν (*haima athōon*, “innocent blood”) as translation of the Hebrew expression *dam naqi* are αἷμα ἀνάτιον (*haima anaition*, “innocent blood” also) in Deut. 19:10; 21:8 f.; and αἷμα δίκαιον (*haima dikaion*, “righteous blood”) in Joel 4:19; Jonah 1:14; Prov. 6:17. Cf. also the variant reading in Matt. 27:4 with the extensive note in *The Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1966), p. 108.

32 Cf. Ps. 14:5 (LXX; 15:5 MT), where among the requirements for one coming to the Holy Mountain is mentioned “and he has not taken bribes against the innocent.”

33 That is the translation of the RSV; the NEB has “reward.”

say "So be it" (*genoito*), and accept it as valid. It is part of the rules of the covenant, and it should not be forgotten that it was part of the Torah, read in regular periods, that Law which was the very life of Israel. It would take us too far afield if we were to deal extensively here with the horrible reality that was expressed by that word "curse."³⁴ He who lives under it is not only "unclean," but also an outlaw, whose life and that of his kin will be destroyed under the wrath of God. Such a man stands in the line of Cain, who is the prototype of a man who kills his fellow and is called "Cursed" (Genesis 4:11).³⁵

These ideas about "innocent blood" were not obsolete in New Testament and later times. They did not belong to a "primitive phase" in Israel's religion, but were understood also by early Christians. There is an interesting witness to this in the apocryphal Gospel called the *Protevangelium Jacobi*. It describes (14:1) the moral, religious difficulty of Joseph who has discovered the pregnancy of Mary. What is he to do? He is in an awful dilemma: either she has committed adultery, and then in hiding her sin he would run counter to God's law (Numbers 5), or she has received child from an angel, and then "I will be found to have betrayed (*paradidous*) innocent blood to the sentence of death." He does not say so expressly, but it is presupposed that it would be committing a grave sin in having had Mary condemned because of adultery. The parallelism in wording between that text and Matthew 27:4 is very striking, as de Strycker and Smid have observed.³⁶ But I wonder whether the author of the *Protevangelium Jacobi* simply copied Matthew. I am inclined to think that he knew what was implied in the expression "innocent blood."³⁷ A very great difficulty in accepting the theory that it was derived from St. Matthew is, in my opinion, the fact that the bribing which plays such an important role in Matthew 27 is completely absent here. The word *paradidous* is here less "betraying" than "handing over to." The author of the *Protevangelium Jacobi* could describe the dilemma of Joseph in the way he did because he knew or

34 See C.A. Keller, 'rry, *verfluchen*, in Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann, eds., *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament* (Munich: C. Kaiser, 1971), cols. 236–240, with references to other literature.

35 See the peculiar paraphrase of Josephus, in *Antiquities* I. 2, 1, sec. 58, which is given in the text of the essay below, in section IV.

36 E. de Strycker, *La forme la plus ancienne du Protévangile de Jacques* (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1961), pp. 128–129; H.R. Smid, *Protevangelium Jacobi, A Commentary* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1965), pp. 100–101.

37 Also in the difficult text of 23:3, in the words of Zechariah, who is threatened by Herod: "I am God's martyr, if you shed my blood; for the Master will receive my spirit, because you are shedding innocent blood at the entrance of the Lord's temple." See H.R. Smid, *op. cit.*, pp. 159–160, for the textual variants of this text.

could conceive so clearly what a man living in the Jewish sphere and taking the Law seriously would experience. Joseph is in either case “cursed”; in running counter to the rule of Numbers 5 or to that which so strongly condemns the shedding of innocent blood (Deuteronomy 27:25).

The reality of the curse was also for the early Christians a living one.³⁸ To give a few examples: the argument of St. Paul in Galatians 3:10 ff. is based on it, and the apostle’s offer of himself as an *anathema* for his brethren (Romans 9:13) is inspired by this world of ideas.³⁹

In the preceding paragraphs the main connotations that go with the “shedding of innocent blood” are mentioned: sin, impurity, curse, and final destruction. It should be remembered that these realities, though starting in a murder committed by a single person, spread their effects on the family and the country of the murderer; the impurity is like an infection, because God’s whole order of righteousness is broken.

IV

What does the declaration of Judas, “I have sinned by betraying innocent blood,” mean against this background?

Before trying to answer that question, let us first have a look at a most remarkable passage, written by Josephus with regard to that prototype of a manslaughter: Cain. He writes in *Antiquities* I, 2, 1, sec. 58:

So, on the one hand, he [sc. God] remitted the penalty due him for the murder, since he [sc. Cain] had offered a sacrifice and through it besought him not to bring wrath on him too heavily; on the other hand, he made him accursed and threatened to punish his descendents in (*kata*) the seventh generation, and he expelled him from that land. . . .

Here Cain is not immediately punished for his murder, because he offers a sacrifice to God—a kind of midrash that goes beyond the Old Testament text, as is often the case with Josephus—but he and his progeny will suffer under a curse.

Now Judas has accepted money to betray Jesus, so he falls under the curse of Deuteronomy 27:25. But he brings back the money and tries to undo that

38 And not only for Christians, but also for their pagan contemporaries, as is witnessed by many texts, *e.g.*, in the magical papyri.

39 This theme is treated in my contribution to the forthcoming *Festschrift* for Professor C.F.D. Moule.

particularly aggrieving factor. He does not say, "I am accursed, because I took the money in order to kill innocent blood." In that case his sin might perhaps be done away by a sacrifice, though in the background lurks of course the threat of Deuteronomy 27:25. The priests, however, do not open that way: "What does that matter to us?" or, "What has it to do with us?"⁴⁰ It may be that the words *su opsē* ("see to it yourself!")⁴¹ are a Latinism (*videris*, you may see to that, it does not bother me).⁴² At any rate that whole business of sin and innocent blood is his concern. And that means that he is a cursed man according to the Law with all the implications and consequences that go with a curse.

A curse can only be removed if the object of it is taken away—see, *e.g.*, in the Old Testament the famous story of Achan in Joshua 7. Very illuminating for our purpose is the story of II Samuel 21:1 ff.: there is a famine in Israel, because in his days Saul had killed Gibeonites (verse 1, "because he put to death the Gibeonites"); David calls them and asks, "How shall I make propitiation?" and they demand the lives of seven members of Saul's family, to hang them in the sun (verse 6, "Let us hang them in the sun before the Lord");⁴³ their request is granted, and then God listens to the country again (verse 14). Here atonement is made by the hanging of these seven members of the house of Saul.

The reason Judas hanged himself lies in what he declares in verse 4. According to Jewish thought about the curse, the way that was open to him, after the way of sacrifice was barred, was that of doing away with himself by hanging. Here the rule could be applied, although the wording is different, that one who is hanged is a curse: Deuteronomy 21:23, *killat elohim talui*—"Accursed by God is every one who is hanged" (LXX; but LXX adds, "upon a tree," also in Paul, Galatians 3:13, but not in the Hebrew).⁴⁴ In hanging himself, Judas executes the sentence, pronounced in Deuteronomy 27:25; he accepts the word of the Lord, since his deed of selling Jesus cannot be undone, and he knows that he is a cursed man whose wicked influence will spread over the country; in doing away with himself, he does away with the curse.

40 See W. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, translated by W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, and Cambridge: University Press, 1957), p. 717, πρὸς III 5 c.

41 Cf. in Matt. 27:24 the words of Pilate, who says in washing his hands: "I am innocent of this blood. You see to it, yourselves."

42 F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, translated by R.W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, and Cambridge: University Press, 1961), sec. 361.

43 Josephus in his paraphrase (*Antiquities* VII. 12, 1, sec. 296–297) does not speak about atonement, but only of punishment.

44 Strack and Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, pp. 544–545.

Two more remarks of a more homiletic kind may be made. (a) It is unfair to contrast Judas and Peter as has been done so often:⁴⁵ Matthew 26:75, Peter “went outside and wept bitterly,” and 27:5, Judas “went away and hanged himself”; for Peter did not have to face the curse pronounced in the Law. Judas’ sin of selling Jesus was of a different, much graver order than Peter’s denial.⁴⁶ Their attitude towards Jesus is totally different and should not be compared. (b) We referred before to that Pauline passage of Galatians 3:10 ff.: Jesus “having become a curse for us.” There a comparison could be made: Judas *was* a curse according to the Law, and tried to clear it away by his own hand but utterly perished; Jesus was *made* a curse (cf. also II Corinthians 5:21), and thereby cleared it away, being raised from the dead.⁴⁷ But this parallelism is not made in the New Testament, and is just a “pious reflection” which, however, brings us to the heart of the New Testament and the mystery of man’s existence: curse and atonement.

It is a somber story, told in sober words, without any exaggeration. But when read against its background in Jewish life of those days, its dramatic force shines out.

I offer this paper to Sherman Johnson in gratitude for his cordial friendship, which shows its fullness in Biblical simplicity.

45 See, *e.g.*, Schniewind, *loc. cit.*

46 In the early Church a shift takes place, because the denial of Peter was a direct “example” to the believers far more than the deed of Judas, which was a one-time occurrence.

47 See my article, mentioned above in note 39.

Translation versus the Dictionary—Mark 8:33 // Matthew 16:23

It is right and proper that in this offering to our colleague and friend Grossouw much attention is paid to questions of Bible translation. He has, after all, devoted a large part of his life to this quiet, unspectacular but high service to the Lord of the Church and His people. But the concluded work is never complete and only one who has himself been intensively occupied with conveying a message, and, *a fortiori*, the Message, from one language into a completely different one, is aware of what unsolved and often insoluble questions lie here. My thanks, then, will be given expression through discussion of one concrete case.

In the translation of the last part of Mark 8:33=Matt 16:23, *ou phroneis ta tou theou alla tōn anthropōn* a notable problem arises which is not only significant from an exegetical point of view, but also has aspects that are interesting for the discussion of translation technique.

In the tradition of Mark and Matthew the quoted words, absent in Luke, form the justification for the sharp rebuke and rebuff given by Jesus to Peter, when he calls his disciple “Satan” after the latter’s reaction to the first prediction of the suffering of the Messiah. On account of both the subject (Jesus’ suffering) and the sharp clash between the Master and his disciple related here, this little pericope has always been given much attention, especially as it immediately follows the central confession of Peter: “You are the Christ” (in Matthew with the addition “the Son of the living God”, followed by the beatification spoken over Peter which has had such great consequences for church history).

The transmission of the text of this justification exhibits no variants, so that no text-critical problems arise. The question that does arise, however, is the one to which this paper is devoted, namely how these words are to be understood and translated.

Or is this a superfluous question? This may appear to be the case, to judge from the almost moving agreement that is evident in translations from the most varied of backgrounds. This agreement may be apparent from the overview that follows, noting that the text of the two Gospels is almost always translated in the same way. So we read in:

* Translated from the Dutch by David E. Orton.

Statenvertaling: “gij verzint niet de dingen, die Gods zijn, maar die der menschen zijn” (“you do not consider the things that are God’s but those of men”);

Lutherse Vertaling: “gij meent niet wat goddelijk, maar wat menschelijk is” (“you do not think what is divine but what is human”);

Leidse Vertaling: “gij hebt niet Gods gedachten, maar menschelijke” (“you have not God’s thoughts, but human thoughts”);

Brouwer: “gij bedenkt niet wat God wil, maar wat de menschen willen” (“you do not think about what God wants, but what people want”);

Canisius: “gij zijt niet bedacht op wat God wil, maar slechts op wat de menschen willen” (“you are not concerned with what God wants, but only with what humans want”);

Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap: “gij zijt niet bedacht op de dingen Gods, maar op die der mensen” (“you are not concerned with the things of God, but with those of men”);

Willibrord: “gij laat u leiden door menselijke overwegingen en niet door wat God wil” (“you let yourself be guided by human considerations and not by what God wants”).

Alongside these Dutch translations we cite a few foreign ones from the present century:

Menge: “deine Gedanken sind nicht auf Gott, sondern auf die Menschen gerichtet”;

Zürich: “du sinnst nicht, was göttlich, sondern was menschlich ist”;

Wilckens: “nicht Gottes Gedanken, sondern Menschengedanken im Sinn hast du”;

Bible de Jérusalem: “tes pensées ne sont pas celles de Dieu, mais celles des hommes”;

Traduction Oecuménique: “tes vues ne sont pas celles de Dieu, mais celles des hommes” (here a note indicates that “vues” is literally “les pensées”);

Moffatt: “your outlook is not God’s, but man’s”;

New English Bible: “You think as man thinks, not as God thinks.”

This overview could of course easily be extended, but it will suffice for the purposes of this discussion, because it represents the most commonly used translations, and from my research it is apparent that an extension of the list would not change the picture. It is clear that generally the verb *phronein* is rendered by “think”, “consider”, or an equivalent term. It should be noted that the Vulgate set a precedent here with the translation: *quoniam* (Matt: *quia*) *non sapis quae Dei sunt, sed quae sunt hominum*.

There is a certain, though not too important, divergence in how the object of this thinking should be rendered, because the article *ta*, used as a pronoun, can stand for different things.

In the list of translations given above, the reader may have noticed the absence of the *Revised Standard Version*. Rightly so, because this version steps out of line with its translation: “you are not on the side of God, but of men”. Alongside this one might note the personal translation by *A. van Veldhuizen* in the series “Tekst en Uitleg”: “Gij neemt het niet op voor God, maar voor de menschen” (“You do not take God’s part, but men’s”).¹ In his commentary section, alternatives are offered: “Ge heult met, kiest de partij van de menschen en niet van God” (“You go along with, or choose the party of men and not of God”), and the rationale for this is given as “To consider the things of someone’ means to agree with someone, to side with him.”²

If we consult the commentaries on these texts from the past century, then we see that almost all of them start by giving an explanation on the basis of the “majority translation”. There are just a few exceptions which seem to adhere to the view of Van Veldhuizen and the RSV. Since they are so exceptional, it will not be misplaced to present their arguments.

A. Schlatter, true to style, refers to four passages in Flavius Josephus where the phrase *phronein ta tinos* occurs and then adds: “Der Jünger hat sich zu entscheiden, ob er für die Menschen oder für Gott Partei nimmt. Von ihm wird verlangt, dass er mit seinen Gedanken und Begehrungen nicht an Menschen hafte, sondern sich auf Gottes Seite stelle.”³ *A.B. Bruce* quotes the Latin rendering in the commentaries of Wolf and Kypke from the 18th century: *non stas a Dei partibus*, or: *studere rebus*, and adds the English translation: “to be on God’s side, or to study the Divine interest instead of the human”, though without citing the Greek texts, which one is evidently expected to look up in the work of his predecessors.⁴ *C.B. Cranfield* is very clear: “to take someone’s side”, “espouse someone’s cause”, with reference to a single passage in Demosthenes.⁵ A somewhat odd intermediate position is taken by E.P. Gould, who, appealing to the Grimm & Thayer lexicon translates “to side with one”, but follows this with: “Peter did not keep in mind God’s purposes, but men’s. He did not look at things as God looks at them, but as men regard them”, thus reverting to the

1 A. van Veldhuizen, *Het Evangelie van Markus* (Groningen 1933), p. 55.

2 Van Veldhuizen, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

3 A. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Matthäus* (Stuttgart 1929), p. 518.

4 A.B. Bruce, *The Expositor’s Greek Testament, I: The Synoptic Gospels* (repr. Grand Rapids, n.d.), p. 226.

5 C.B. Cranfield, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (Cambridge 1959), p. 281.

majority view.⁶ It is not entirely clear where H.B. Swete comes down on this:⁷ he remarks that “His [Peter’s] resistance to the thought of the Passion revealed a deep cleavage between his mind and the mind of God”, adding: “on this fundamental point [i.e. the preaching of the Cross] he was not in sympathy with the Divine order of things”; he then refers not only to such texts as Rom 8:5; Phil 3:19; Col 3:2, most of which are given some discussion, but also to two passages in the Septuagint and two texts from profane Greek literature, namely in Demosthenes and Dionysius Hal., but he does not give consideration to the meaning that the phrase *phronein ta tinos* has there.

So is the translation followed by the overwhelming majority of translators and commentators the correct one, or is it the handful of exceptions that have the right end of the stick?

When we consult the dictionaries for an answer to this question, we find that both Liddell, Scott & Jones with the wording “to be of another’s *mind*, be on his side or of his party”⁸ and Walter Bauer with the rendering “die Partei jmds. ergreifen, auf jmds. Seite stehen”,⁹ support the view of Van Veldhuizen and the RSV and not that of the majority of translations. This is not an innovation by modern lexicography, as this view is also to be found in Stephanus’s *Thesaurus Graecus* from the 16th century and in Passow;¹⁰ we noted already that Gould refers to Grimm & Thayer. It is only in the treatment given in Kittel’s *Wörterbuch* that things have become rather clouded, because there, though in the discussion of the usage by Josephus it is said “bezieht sich auf Gesinnung und Haltung, bes. auf politische Anhänger und Parteigänger” (citing six references), later in the discussion of the Gospel texts this view is not considered at all, but it is simply stated that “Petrus vermag nur menschliche Gedanken, die auf irdisches Leben und Wohlergehen ausgerichtet sind, zu fassen.”¹¹ As a result, one might gain the impression that the usage observed in Josephus is a specialty of this author. However, this is absolutely not the case, as is evident from the other dictionaries, but this does not come to light because Bertram,

6 E.P. Gould, *Gospel according to St. Mark* (Edinburgh 1896), p. 155.

7 H.B. Swete, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (London 31920), p. 181.

8 H.G. Liddell, R. Scott & H. Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford 91940), p. 1956, sub 2c.; but it is curious that Matt 16:23 is not mentioned there, but under 2a “to have certain thoughts”. No reason is given for this discrepancy!

9 W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur* (Berlin 51958), col. 1713, sub 2.

10 H. Stephanus, *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (Paris 1572), vol. V, s.v.; F. Passow, *Handwörterbuch der Griechischen Sprache* (1857, repr. Darmstadt 1970), vol. II 2, s.v. Cf. also C.A. Wahl, *Clavis Librorum Veteris Testamenti Apocryphorum philologica* (Leipzig 1852), s.v.

11 G. Bertram, in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich, eds., *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Bd.10, (Stuttgart 1973), pp. 225, 228.

the author of this article, has neglected to indicate what was the *current* Greek usage. If attention had been given to this, then the treatment of Mark 8:33 and Matt 16:23 would also have to have been different and the possibility of interpretation in this light should have been considered.

As far as I have been able to determine, the first to see that a current Greek idiom was to be read here in the Gospel texts was the German minister Raphelius in 1715.¹² He had come up against this in his reading of Polybius and found more material in Stephanus's Thesaurus. Accordingly he translates Matt 16:23 as follows: "Es nicht mit GOTT / sondern mit den Menschen halten", "ut vim graecae phraseos exacte exprimit lingua nostra vernacula". The same understanding is found in his contemporary, our compatriot, the Leiden professor Alberti,¹³ while—of course, one might well say—Wettstein too, without reiterating or citing Raphelius, in a detailed note on Matt 16:23 quotes the appropriate passages from Greek authors in support of his translation: "non sectaris partes Dei".¹⁴

Strangely enough this insight, which is thus to be found in various well-known commentaries from the 18th century, was later almost completely lost in the exegetical tradition of the 19th and 20th centuries. In the long series of commentaries I have consulted, this possibility of translation is, with very rare exceptions, not even noted, let alone discussed. Apparently the point of departure was simply the knowledge that *phronein* = "think", "have in mind", linked with an object, without bothering to consult a dictionary and to wonder whether a particular Greek idiom might be involved here. Be that as it may, with all this disagreement between translations and dictionaries there is every reason to take a new look at this question.

It is a well-known fact that words do not "have" a meaning in themselves but that they receive it from their context. For that reason, in order to reach a decision on the question in point, I have collected some 60 passages from the above-mentioned works on the basis of indications given there and from my own reading, in which the expression *phronein ta tinos* occurs. No doubt further research will bring more texts to light,¹⁵ but for the moment this collection will be adequate and sufficiently representative. In the context of this article it

12 G. Raphelius, *Annotationes philologicae in Novum Testamentum ex Polybio et Arriano collectae* (Hamburg 1715), pp. 79–82 (a very extensive treatment).

13 J. Alberti, *Observationes philologicae in sacros Novi Foederis libros* (Leiden 1725), pp. 112–113.

14 J.J. Wettstenius, *Novum Testamentum Graecum* (Amsterdam 1751), vol. I, p. 443.

15 Experience with the "Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti" has taught us this; for many Greek writers there are no full *indices verborum*, so that one has to rely on one's own reading.

would take up too much space if I were to give a detailed discussion of all the texts known to me; we shall therefore be content with a number of examples borrowed from various authors.

Two observations need to be made at the beginning of this discussion: (a) the texts from the Pauline letters that are often cited in this connection, namely Rom 8:5–8; Phil 2:2ff.; 3:19; 4:10, Col 3:2 are not exactly parallels from a grammatical point of view, with the exception of Rom 8:5, *ta tes sarkos phronousin . . . ta tou pneumatou*; but since the Pauline antithesis of “flesh and spirit” imprints its mark so clearly on the passage, it is dubious whether this text can simply be cited in clarification of the one in Matthew and Mark; and (b) in the Septuagint the expression is not found in the books translated from the Tanakh. There are only two passages in the deuterocanonical books, oddly enough both of them in letters by heathen kings and in a clearly political context:

1. 1 Macc 10:20 in a letter from the Syrian king Antiochus to Jonathan the Maccabee, whom he appoints as high priest, giving him the honorific title “friend of the king” and charging him “*phronein ta hēmōn* = represent our interests and maintain friendship towards us”;
2. The Addition to Esth 8:12b in the address of the letter from Artaxerxes to the rulers of the 127 satrapies and “*tois ta hemetera phronousin* = to those who support our affairs, or are well disposed towards us”.¹⁶

On the basis of these two texts, then, one cannot say that in this expression we find a specifically biblical usage; on the contrary, whatever the origin of these two documents may be, the fact that they are attributed to heathen kings points to the fact that the authors are following current Greek usage. That the latter conclusion is correct may be evident from what follows.

The first writer in Greek literature in whose work the expression is found is *Herodotus*. He speaks in II 161f. of a revolutionary movement among the Egyptians against King Apries; the latter has an envoy shamefully mistreated by the leader of the opposing party, Amasis; “when the rest of the Egyptians who were still at his side (*hoi eti ta ekeinou ephroneon*) saw that a man who stood in very high regard among them was so shamefully treated, they did not hesitate to change sides.”

In VII 102 Xerxes is warned that the Spartans will face him in battle, “even though all the other Greeks are on your side” (*ta sa phroneōsi*). In VIII 34 it is narrated that the whole people of Boeotia was on the side of the Medes (*emēdize*); the Macedonians wanted to make it clear to Xerxes that the

¹⁶ Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* XI 273 borrows the expression.

Boeotians *ta Medōn phroneoien* = support the cause of the Medes; in this case the parallel is very interesting and the synonym is illuminating. VIII 72.2–3 is particularly telling: Themistocles has someone tell the Persians that the leader of the Greeks is on the side of the Persian king (*tugchanei gar phroneōn to basileos*): “because the Greeks are not of one mind among themselves (*oute gar allēloisi homophroneousi*), nor will they offer resistance to you any longer but you will see in conflict with each other those who are on your side and those who are not” (*tous ta humetera phroneontas kai tous mē*).”

In view of the fact that reference has already been made to *Demosthenes* (see above, p. 19), that text must be mentioned here, namely at *Philipp.* 3.18: “and why would you be in danger if something should happen? . . . because of the fact that the Peloponnesians are on his (Philip’s) side” (*takeinou phronēsai*). We may also refer to the following texts: 3.56: “in the municipality of Olynthus some were well disposed towards Philip (*tines men Philippou*), serving him in all regards, but a few others who sought the best for the city and used everything in their power to ensure that the citizens should not become slaves. Which of the two brought the downfall of the fatherland? . . . Those who were on the side of Philip (*hoi ta Philippou phronountes*) and who, when the city was still in existence, falsely accused and defamed those who pleaded its case”: *De classibus* XIV 34: “because, since the Thebans are on the side of Philip (*takeinou phronountōn*), their enemies are necessarily on the side of the Greeks (*ta tōn Hellēnōn phronein*).” See also *de Corona* XVIII 161: “the Thebans, indeed almost yourself too through those of Philip’s party . . . (*hypo tōn ta Philippou phronountōn*)”.

The expression is also found among other authors from the “classical” period, e.g. *Xenophon*, *Hell.* VI 3.14: “of all the cities some stand on your side, but others on ours (*hai men ta humetera, hai de ta hēmetera phronousai*) and in each city some are on the side of Laconia, others on that of Attica”—VII 4.40: “we will wage war against Arcadia and fight together with those who stand on our side (*sun tois ta hēmetera phronousin polemēsomen*)”—VII 5.5: Epaminondas reflected, however, that his people had supporters in Peloponnesus also—the Argives, the Messenians, and such of the Arcadians as held to his side (*tous ta sphetera phronountas*); and Thucydides III 68.3: the Thebans gave the city over to . . . “all their adherents among the Plataeans that remained alive (*hosoi ta sphetera phronountōn Plataiōn periēsan*)”—V 84.1: Alcibiades sailed to Argos and took 300 men who seemed to be suspect and supporters of Sparta (*ta Lakedaimeniōn phronein*); VI 51.2: among the Catanaeans some favoured the Syracusians (*hoi men ta tōn Surakosiōn phronountes*) rather than Athens.

From a later time I would refer to *Polybius* XXX 7.5 and 9: men of the party of Perseus (*phronountes ta Perseōs*) against the Romans in various places, such as

Kos and Rhodes—XXX 30.3: Eumenes is accused in the Roman Senate by the inhabitants of Prusia of supporting his adherents (*tous ta sphetera phronountas*) and of humiliating the adherents of the Romans (*tous de ta Rhomaiōn hairoumenous*), who wanted to live in accordance with the decisions of the Senate, in all kinds of ways”.

Dionysius Hal., *Ant. Rom.* III 49.4: King Tarquinius goes on an expedition against a Latin colony which had submitted to Rome under Romulus, but on Tarquinius's assumption of office switched back to the Latins (*ta Latinōn authis ērxato phronein*)—XI 39.7: all desired to put an end to the oligarchy, but the supporters of the oligarchy (*hoi phronountes ta tēs oligarchias*) had weapons and instilled much fear. Diodorus Siculus XIII 48.4: in Cercyra great dissension arose and people murdered one another out of mutual hatred, “because the notables, whose desire was towards the oligarchy, kept to the side of the Spartans (*ephronoun ta tōn Lakedaimoniōn*) but the mass of the people were keen to fight on the side of the Athenians (*tois Athēnaiois summachein*)”—7 the Athenians come to help them and suddenly attack the supporters of the Spartans (*tous ta Lakedaimoniōn phronountas*), some of them being captured, others being killed and more than a thousand banished—8 but after some days some of them who were on the side of the exiles (*tines phronountes ta tōn phugadōn*) managed to occupy the market and bring the exiles back, and both parties then came to an agreement.—XIII 72.1 Thrasybulus conquered Thasus, forced the inhabitants to take up the exiles who stood on the Athenian side (*tous ta tōn Athēnaiōn phronountas*) and conclude an alliance with Athens.—XIV 32.4 the Thirty Tyrants have banished various people from Athens and accuse the inhabitants of Eleusis and Salamis of being on the side of the exiles (*ta tōn phugadōn phronein*).—XX 35.2 the Samnites, not hindered by the Roman army, destroyed those of the Iapyges who were on the side of the Romans (*tous ta Rhomaiōn phronountas*).—XX 90.3 the Romans conquered a city and granted the citizenship of Rome to some who had shown that they were on the side of the Romans (*ta tōn Rhomaiōn pephronēkenai*).

In *Flavius Josephus* the expression is very common; the four passages indicated by Schlatter can easily be multiplied. I shall mention only a few examples, with no aim for comprehensiveness: *Ant. Jud.* VII 202 it is reported to David that Ahithophel was with Absalom and represented the latter's interests (*ta toutou phronōn*)—204 David asks Hushai to go to Absalom, pretending to be a supporter (*hōs ta ekeinou phronounta*) in order to find out Absalom's secret plans and counter the advice of Ahithophel.—286: “If you are for the king (*ei de phroneite ta tou basileōs*), follow Joab his general” (LXX 2 Sam 20:11: who is of David = *tis tou David*). XII 392 a number of apostate Jews report the Jewish people and the Maccabees to the Syrian king for destroying all the

“friends” of the king (well-known designation of the confidants of the Seleucid princes)¹⁷ and all those who were on his side (*hosoi ta ekeinou phronountes*: 1 Macc 7:5 mentions only the “friends”).—XII 399 Alcimus killed all he could find who were supporters of Judas (*ta Juda phronountas*).—XXIII 28 Jonathan assembled a large band of his supporters (*para tōn ta autou phronountōn*).—XIII 377 Alexander Jannaeus takes to the field with mercenaries and 20,000 Jews “who were on his side” (*hoi ephronoun ta ekeinou*); from what follows it is evident that there were also Jews fighting on his opponent’s side. XIV 268 unrest emerged in Syria under the Romans; one of the conspirators is Barsus Caecilius, one of the supporters of Pompey (*heis tōn ta Pompēiou phronountōn*).—XIV 450 Galileans seceded and drowned the supporters of Herod (*tous ta Hērodou phronountas*). XV 172 Malakus, king of the Arabs, informed Hyrcanus, pressed hard by Herod, that he wanted to take him in with his whole household and “all the Jews that were on his side” (*tous sun autōi pantas kai Judaion hosoi ta ekeinou phronousin*).—Vita 20: Josephus, returning from Rome, finds the land in a state of incipient revolution; he sounds a warning, but is afraid that he will be suspected of consorting with the enemy (*hos ta tōn polemiōn phronōn*) and that his life is therefore in danger.—See also *Bell. Jud.* I 464; *A.J.* VII 28; XIV 90.

It would take up too much of the available space to supplement the texts cited here with additional material from later writers such as Plutarch, Pausanias, Herodianus, Origen, Eusebius, Socrates etc. The examples could be multiplied by doing this, but the picture would not change as a result. However, it is appropriate to mention that such an extension would be possible, so as to show that in the expression *phronein ta tinou* we are dealing with a Greek idiom, the meaning of which stayed the same throughout the centuries. In the material I have collected to date, not a single departure from the basic pattern has emerged.

From the examples given, deliberately borrowed from a wide variety of writers and from a period of five centuries, one can clearly see that the meaning given by the dictionaries holds in all cases: “be on the side of”, “be a supporter of”. In a few cases synonyms or contrasts are offered in the context which illuminate the meaning. But to gain a sharp view of the idiom it is not sufficient to be content with this rendering; something more needs to be said. In the survey above we have purposefully not been content with listing references or just a few examples. After all, the context needs to be viewed to see how such an idiom is used and one should be familiar with a reasonable number of specimens to be

17 E. Bikerman, *Institutions des Séleucides* (Paris 1938), pp. 40–42.

in a position to establish whether the usage is fixed or whether variations need to be reckoned with. And, indeed, it emerges from the given examples that the expression *phronein ta tinos* always occurs in a political context. In each case the context is a conflict over hegemony between two parties in a political situation: princes, peoples, groups in a country or city are opposed to each other, in conflict with each other, so that one party can subject and rule over the other; the other party tries to prevent this so as to live a quiet life or to gain power themselves. The phenomenon then may occur that one party has supporters in the other camp; sometimes the situation is such that attempts are made to gain adherents among third parties whose position is such that they can make a decisive impact in the power game. These supporters are referred to with the term *hoi phronountes ta tinos*. The phrase *ta tinos* itself is a familiar usage for “one’s things”, “someone’s affairs”;¹⁸ we may supplement this with *pragmata*, in the sense of “reins of government”.¹⁹ From the given examples it is also clear that the *phronein* is more than just a “disposition” that is for whatever reason kept hidden, existing only in one’s thoughts, which after all, as they say, are “free”. No, the sympathisers are clearly identifiable; they do not just give moral support but also promote the affairs of “their party” very practically and sometimes have to pay the price for doing so. Their loyalty to a particular prince or group is, after all, revealed by their opposition to their immediate environment.

Let us, then, return to our point of departure, the texts of Mark 8:33 and Matt 16:23. In the exegesis and translation of the *Novum Testamentum graece* we are bound, of course (to state the obvious) to follow Greek usage. In the present case this is completely clear, because we were able to determine that the expression *phronein ta tinos* always has the same content, without exception. If one wants to diverge from this in the explanation of the Gospels one will have to have very strong grounds for doing so. And to date I have not come across any such grounds. Nor is it completely clear to me why in modern commentaries the understanding advanced by 18th-century exegetes like the much-consulted Wettstein remains undiscussed. Be that as it may, in view of Greek usage there is every reason, in this case too, to keep it in mind and apply it in the translation and explanation.

In that case, we would need to translate, with the authors mentioned above: “you are not on the side of God but on that of men”, or “you are not an adherent of God’s cause, but of that of men”. This interpretation fits well with the

18 W. Bauer, *op. cit.*, cols. 1092–1093.

19 Liddell, Scott & Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 1457, s.v. III 2.

preceding words, “Get behind Me, Satan”, because the expression *opisō* + gen. very frequently has a political meaning: “to be behind someone” = “be a follower of someone”.²⁰ Jesus is no longer willing to count Peter among His followers because he stands on the wrong side, because he does not want to let God’s plan (v. 31 *dei*) come about, pointing instead to another side, human safety (cf. *hileōs soi* in Matt, v. 22). The addition *skandalon ei emou* is then rightly found in Matthew, since Peter is trying to persuade Jesus to give up His loyalty to God.²¹

As the kingdom is such a central concern in the Gospels, their use of this political terminology, in which precisely the adherence to and the promotion of the interests of a king are so heavily implicated, should not occasion surprise.

What may, however, cause a degree of astonishment is the fact that this good Greek idiom occurs here in the synoptic tradition. This surprise, however, should not lead to the fixed Greek usage being divested of its meaning. Its occurrence here must be seen as an indication of the tradition process of this extremely important pericope. It is completely explicable as a clarification that is given and had to be given in a Greek-speaking community, of the preceding words, in particular concerning that *Satana*. In the context of this contribution we cannot go into further detail on this aspect. But be that as it may, there can be no doubt as to the meaning of the Greek text as it has come down to us.

This critique of a translation found also in the Willibrord text to which our colleague Grossouw has contributed so much, is not only an evidence of my esteem for his work, but also a sign that the work of translation is a never-ending work of expressing the message we have received in the words of our own language.

20 M. Hengel, *Nachfolge und Charisma* (Berlin 1968), pp. 20ff.

21 Cf. G. Stählin, in Kittel & Friedrich, *Theol. Wörterbuch*, vol. VII, s.v., esp. the observation on p. 343: “Der neutestamentliche Gebrauch . . . ist formal und inhaltlich ausschliesslich bestimmt vom Denken und Reden des Alten Testaments und des Judentums. Wie fern die Wörter dem griechischen Denken liegen, geht nicht nur aus ihren Fehlen in der griechischen Literatur hervor, sondern auch aus dem Bedürfnis, das bei Kirchenvätern verschiedentlich sichtbar wird, den Sinn . . . zu erklären.”

The Phrase ταῦτα εἰπὼν in the Gospel According to John

With the widespread interest that inspires the work of our colleague Schippers, embracing as it does New Testament studies, ethics, and the development of Calvinism past and present, the contributor to this Festschrift is faced with an *embarrass du choix*. It would be tempting for me, for instance, to take up the topic of “Hervormd-Gereformeerd” [denominational issues in the Dutch Reformed churches] again, with which the master interviewer Dr. G. Puchinger confronted both of us six years ago and which we then tackled in the form of a monologue.¹ Independently of each other, we then looked back on the path that lay behind us with the topic of that collection in mind. It would be attractive now to spin the thread a little further. But on closer consideration it seemed more appropriate to remain a little closer to our “refuge”, realizing that the honouree and I are linked not only in a general sense by our “profession” (and happily not as colleagues whose hallmark is that they are not “miteinander einverstanden”!), but in particular through a close and cordial collaboration for many years in the context of the Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap [Netherlands Bible Society].

I think back with fondness on the many hours spent together with other colleagues looking for a fine-tuned Dutch translation of the Greek text, but then also on the enjoyable leadership which Schippers gave as the chair of the executive committee for translations in the discussion of the many problems of policy with regard to the work of translation with which the Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap was and is faced. And besides this I am not forgetting everything that he contributed as supervisor of various editions.

So it seems appropriate in gratitude for this collaboration to offer him a discussion of a small translation problem. And this essay is presented to the honouree with the wish that he will be given many more years to help in understanding the meaning of the Word.

In the Gospel of John we find eleven instances of the phrase ταῦτα εἰπὼν in various forms, to which we may add τοῦτο εἰπὼν in 21:9. At first sight the translation would seem to present no difficulties. The demonstrative pronoun ταῦτα

* Translated from the Dutch by David E. Orton.

1 G. Puchinger, *Hervormd-Gereformeerd, één of gescheiden?*, Delft 1969, 85–166.

refers to its antecedent and is often linked with “to say”.² In the commentaries it is therefore unusual to draw attention to it. Schnackenburg alone indicates in passing that this phrase is quite common in John, but he does not present more than just a survey of the texts.³

If one consults the translations a degree of variation may be observed, but this does not indicate more than the variation customary in the translation of a participle like this.

See for instance John 7:9:

Statenvertaling: “als Hij deze dingen tot hen gezegd had . . .” (when He had said these things to them)

Lutherse vertaling: “toen hij dit tot hen gezegd had . . .” (when he had said these things to them)

Leidse vertaling: “na dit gezegd te hebben” (after having said this)

Brouwer: “zo sprak Hij tot hen” (thus he spoke to them)

Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap: “nadat Hij dit tot hen gezegd had” (after He had said this to them)

Willibrord: “Zo sprak Hij tot hen” (thus He spoke to them)

Groot Nieuws voor U: “Dat was zijn antwoord” (that was his answer)

Moffatt: “so saying”

New English Bible: “with this answer”

John 9:6:

Statenvertaling: “Dit gezegd hebbende,” (having said this)

Lutherse vertaling, Leidse vertaling: as above

Brouwer: “toen hij dit gezegd had” (when he had said this)

Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap: “na dit gezegd te hebben” (after having said this)

Willibrord, Groot Nieuws voor U: “toen hij dit gezegd had” (when he had said this)

Moffatt, New English Bible: “with these words”

2 W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*, Berlin ⁵1958, 1183, 1b.

3 R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium, II. Teil, Kommentar zu Kap. 5–12*, Freiburg i.Br. 1971, 307, n. 2: “Die Übergangswendung ταῦτα εἰπὼν kommt bei Joh. relativ häufig vor.”

John 11:28:

Statenvertaling, Lutherse, Leidse vertaling, Goed Nieuws voor U: as above
Brouwer, Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap: “na deze woorden” (after these words)

Moffatt, New English Bible: as in 9:6

It would take up too much space to give such an overview for all the texts concerned. We shall add only John 18:1:

Statenvertaling: “dit gezegd hebbende” (having said this)

Lutherse vertaling: “toen Jezus dit gesproken had” (when Jesus had spoken this)

Leidse vertaling: “toen Jezus dit gezegd had” (when Jesus had said this)

Brouwer: “nadat Jezus deze woorden gesproken had” (after Jesus had spoken these words)

Nederland Bijbelgenootschap: “na dit gezegd te hebben” (after having said this)

Willibrord: “nadat Hij aldus gesproken had” (after He had spoken thus)

Goed Nieuws voor U: “na dit gebed” (after this prayer)

Moffatt: “having said this”

New English Bible: “after these words”.

The other texts are translated analogously. These examples are, however, sufficiently representative to be able to show us that the same wording is not always rendered in an identical way in one single translation; that a certain degree of variation has been applied. The overview above gives a clear picture of the various possibilities open to the translators and their use of them. It would of course have been very easy to have reproduced many more translations in different languages, but this would not have introduced any changes to the picture.

Little comment is called for on these translations as such. It does seem to me, however, that the rendering “with these words” in 11:28 is a little infelicitous in the context, because from the following “she went away and called her sister Mary” an unsuspecting reader or hearer could get the wrong impression. In general it seems appropriate to render the aorist in this phrase with a past tense (thus: “when He had said this” or “after He had said this”), since this makes a clear distinction from the *participium praesentis* that is also used frequently by John (see 1:15, 32; 4:51; 7:15, 28; 9:2, 19; 10:33; 11:32; 12:21, 23; 19:6, 12, 24 and in variants in 11:31; 12:13). The latter phrase more generally indicates simultaneity,

or, as customarily in Greek, the content of what is said (“with these words” or practically equivalent to our colon followed by inverted commas). The distinction made here applies almost always, though attention should be drawn to an exception that demonstrates the rule, namely 11:28 ἐφώνησεν Μαριάμ τὴν ἀδελφὴν εἰπούσα. But in 5:12 ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ εἰπὼν σοι this participle clearly looks back to a command that Jesus has given in the past.

If no more than this were to be said about this matter, the topic would not have needed to be addressed. But it would seem to me that there are indeed a number of aspects that indicate that further examination may be worthwhile.

In the first place it is interesting to consider the context in which the different texts with the words ταῦτα εἰπὼν are found.

a) John 7:9, where Jesus gives his answer to the invitation by his brothers to go to Jerusalem and reveal Himself to the world. Jesus rejects this, because as He says: ὁ ἔμδς καιρὸς οὐπω πεπλήρωται. That is (see also καιρὸς 2x in v. 7) a decisive pronouncement about Jesus’ life’s work.⁴ It is not a simple statement that this time He cannot go or does not feel like it, but an indication that the determined time, God’s time, has not yet come (cf. also the use of “hour” in John, e.g. 13:1).

b) John 9:6; this is preceded by Jesus’ statement that He is the light of the world; it is followed by Him making spittle which he spreads on the eyes of the man born blind to set him on the path of healing. The christological explanation of v. 5 does not have a *direct* connection with the following story, although one can see reasons to make such a connection; in the rest of ch. 9 there is no reference back to the comparison with the light. Rather, v. 5 goes together with v. 4, where there is talk of the night in which no one can work, while the works of Jesus’ Sender must be done. The meaning of Jesus as “light of the world” does not need to be dealt with separately in this study.⁵ That here in v. 5 a pronouncement of great importance for the theology of the Fourth Gospel is being made is self-evident.⁶ And this extremely important saying is followed by: ταῦτα εἰπὼν.

c) John 11:28a, where Martha, who in the preceding verse has expressed her firm belief (πεπιστεύκα), says: “that you are the Christ, the son of God, He who is to come into the world”. Martha’s confession (in direct speech to Jesus) is

4 G. Delling, καιρὸς in: G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Stuttgart 1938, vol. III, 455–463, esp. 461f.; see also the commentaries *ad loc.*

5 Cf. R. Schnackenburg, *op. cit.*, 240–243.

6 Cf. 1:5, 9; 8:12; 12:35, 48.

identical to the wording used to express the purpose of this Gospel (20:31).⁷ Here, then, we see the expression reappearing after such a key saying. It will be noted that here we read τοῦτο εἰποῦσα: the variant with ταῦτα⁸ is clearly a harmonization. This singular, it seems to me, concentrates attention more on the preceding verse; the separate strands are bundled together.

d) John 11:43; here the expression follows the prayer in which Jesus expresses His certainty that God always hears Him (2x); because this fact enables the following miracle (cf. 9:31) and the saying about the multitudes that may believe (this again, cf. also v. 40), that God “has sent” Him (another leitmotif of this Gospel).⁹ So once again this expression ταῦτα εἰπὼν serves to focus attention on a saying of decisive importance.

e) John 13:21, where the phrase follows a saying introduced by the well-known double “amen” so typical of John.¹⁰ This statement is so weighty because it speaks of the line of sending: God—Jesus—disciple (see also below, p. 33); whoever receives the disciple, receives the Lord himself.¹¹ And we can see clearly here that ταῦτα εἰπὼν does not make a connection between what precedes and what follows. What is said after this does not have to do with the preceding saying.

f) John 18:1; this clearly does not relate to a single preceding pronouncement but to the whole preceding prayer. Although the label given to it, the “high-priestly prayer”, is of recent date, no one can deny that it aptly summarises the great significance of ch. 17 in a single term.

g) John 18:22 in the genitive absolute; the words that precede this speak of the teaching of Jesus, which has taken place not in secret but in public.¹² This is of course of key significance, to the evangelist too, who places the proclamation of Jesus at the heart of his work—of significance in a world full of secret doctrine.

7 See my study: “The Purpose of St. John’s Gospel,” in: *Studia Evangelica*, vol. I, Berlin 1959, 382–411, reprinted in my *Sparsa Collecta*, Leiden 1973, 35–62. It may be noted that the verb πιστεύω, which is also mentioned twice in the “purpose” of John, occurs no fewer than 4 times in this passage from ch. 11.

8 See the apparatus in the Nestle-Aland edition, *ad loc.*

9 On this formula cf. J.P. Miranda, *Der Vater, der mich gesandt hat, religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Johanneischen Sendungsformeln*, Bern–Frankfurt/Main 1972.

10 Cf. J. Jeremias, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*, I, *Die Verkündigung Jesu*, Gütersloh 1971, 43–45.

11 See also the synoptic parallels, in: K. Aland, *Synopsis quattuor Evangeliorum*, Stuttgart 1964, 433; the line of the “sending” and the “being-sent” is central.

12 Cf. the central significance of *παρησία* in the Fourth Gospel; see my lecture: *The Christian’s Freedom of Speech in the New Testament*, Manchester 1962.

h) John 18:38 after the words “what is truth”, spoken by Pilate (now again in the singular τοῦτο; see above, p. 28). Here comes the question, which is actually the *Entscheidungsfrage* in the light of the preceding statement about Jesus’ coming ἵνα μαρτυρήσω τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. From 1:17 on “the truth” is a central theme of the Gospel (cf. the extensive discourse in 8:30ff.).

i) John 20:14 of Mary at the empty tomb, who has not yet seen the Risen One and has to confess her ignorance concerning what has happened with Jesus, who is now alive again.

j) John 20:20 of Jesus, who greets His disciples for the first time with the words: “Peace be with you.” But this customary greeting is now heard from the lips of the Risen Lord, who thereby refers back to the promise of 14:27 and gives the ordinary words a new meaning (for the singular τοῦτο εἰπὼν see above, p. 28).

k) John 20:22 again the peace greeting (see the preceding paragraph) and the commissioning of the disciples, who are sent out into the world in the same way that Jesus himself was. This fundamental commission in the life of the disciples for the life of the church is clearly underlined with the words: “this He said” (again in the singular) and afterwards Jesus gives them the Spirit.

l) John 21:19; this text belongs, of course, to the appendix of the Gospel, but this verse is remarkable in that here we are given an explanatory comment, introduced with τοῦτο εἰπὼν, on the drastic prophecy about the end of Peter’s life introduced with the double “amen”; this is followed by ἀκολούθει μοι—the prophecy, so heavy with content, being referred to again; this gives an extra dimension to the call to discipleship.

If, then, one takes account of the places where, and the way in which, the writers of the Fourth Gospel use this phrase, one sees that it is not used in an offhand way to express a transition from one thing to another, but that it always shines a light on a very significant saying. It is not a fill-in by the writer but rather an accentuation of what has just been said; in two instances to underline the hopeless situation of the person who does not see the truth; in the other texts to underline a central aspect of Jesus’ ministry, and of its continuation. One may add to these the texts in which the writer uses the indicative rather than the participle:

6:59 after the great and important discourse of Jesus as the “bread of life”, which elicits the reaction (v. 60) that it is “hard”: ταῦτα εἶπεν in a synagogue, teaching in Capernaum.

11:11 on the decisive walking or not walking in the light, which has to do with the danger that Jesus is in; ταῦτα εἶπεν, with that important saying the matter is dealt with and Jesus can turn his attention to the raising of Lazarus.

16:4 the word that precedes this on the threatening dangers awaiting the disciples: that which is so decisive for their task and life ταῦτα δὲ ὑμῖν ἐξ ἀρχῆς οὐκ εἶπον.

20:18 ταῦτα εἶπεν αὐτῇ, namely to Mary: the assignment which Jesus has given her to tell the disciples that Jesus is going up to their and his Father, to their and his God—now comes that decisive going away, of which He has spoken in the farewell discourses.

The strong emphasis that ταῦτα (and to a lesser extent τοῦτο) has is more pronounced if one also notes the places where John uses it combination with the verb λαλεῖν; see 8:20, 28, 30; 12:36; 14:25; 15:11; 16:1, 4, 6, 25, 33; 17:1, 13.

In the second place, when we check whether this phrase also occurs in the other books of the New Testament, it is striking that on this point John goes his own way.

In Matthew and Mark one looks for ταῦτα εἰπὼν in vain. Luke uses the expression a few times in his writings, but not as frequently as John. In the Gospel of Luke one text is deserving of consideration, namely 19:28: in the vicinity of Jerusalem, when there is a lively expectation that the Kingdom of God will break in imminently, Jesus has spoken the parable of the entrusted money (minas/talents), which in Luke's version ends with the destruction of the King's opponents. After this parable, which is a call to responsibility towards him who is to become King, and finds its culmination in the threat, we read, "καὶ εἰπὼν ταῦτα, Jesus went on ahead, going up to Jerusalem." In this case too it is clear that a heavily charged saying has been spoken, since it is indicated in the parable that the decision will fall there in Jerusalem, the city whose attitude and whose fate are so central in this chapter (19:11, 28, 41).

In Acts the phrase is found in the following texts:

1) Acts 1:9 after Jesus has rejected the question about the restoration of Israel's kingdom and has given the disciples the promise of the Holy Spirit with the commission to be His witnesses in the whole world. After these words He was taken away. The word that Jesus has spoken is decisive for history, for the life of the disciples and also points the direction for this book. It is thus beyond all doubt that Luke is here underlining that at this time and herewith Jesus has spoken his last word on earth and has left His "testament".

2) Acts 19:40 brings in another setting. After the commotion that Demetrius instigated against the Christians, the town clerk managed to calm the baying masses by reminding people of the risks associated with being charged with unmotivated tumult. *Stasis* was something that the Roman authorities did not tolerate and which they were apt to put down bloodily. The history books

contain many stories of the suppression of such disturbances, which were potentially very dangerous for the stability of Roman rule.—With the phrase ταῦτα εἰπὼν, then, this saying is meant, which calls for caution by pointing to the threatening dangers. That it was heavily charged (“we are in danger!”) needs no further proof for anyone familiar with the heavy-handed methods used by the Romans in bringing order in such cases. Here—and this is notable after what precedes it—the phrase is not used in a religious setting but in a profane context.

3) Acts 20:36 after Paul has given his farewell speech to the elders of Ephesus, that great “*apologia pro vita sua*” (20:18ff.). It is striking in how much detail here in vv. 37 and 38 Luke describes the emotions that are released when Paul has given this speech, mainly because the definitive separation between this apostle and his community is announced here (vv. 25, 38). So the writer does not leave us in uncertainty as to the significance and “weight” of this speech. For himself and his purposes this passage was of course important, because in it the central figure of the apostle Paul is given a full-length portrait. The expression naturally relates to the entire speech and not only to the concluding words.

4) Acts 27:34: εἴπας δὲ ταῦτα—these words spoken in a dangerous situation in which Paul and his fellow-passengers are looking death in the eye. The apostle persuades his fellow travellers to have something to eat, promising them that they will not suffer the slightest injury.¹³ And he himself sets an example. Here we again see clearly that a formidable strength underlies the simple words in which Luke tells us all this. Again the expression εἴπας δὲ ταῦτα serves to indicate the special nature of this powerful language in this critical situation.

Alongside these passages that are to be found in the now current text, two others may be noted, which we encounter in variants, namely:

5) Acts 26:30 (see the Nestle apparatus) as the conclusion to the description of Paul's appearance before Agrippa. In answer to the king's ironic comment Paul has expressed the wish that all his hearers, including Agrippa, would become Christians. In the words γενέσθαι τοιούτους ὅποῖος ἐγὼ εἰμι with their qualitative description, the terrific significance of being a Christian is brought to expression. Instead of the rather abrupt transition in the text as presented by Nestle, the variant gives a stronger expression in which the significance of Paul's last words is further underlined.

6) Acts 28:29, an addition in the Koine text (see Nestle's apparatus), in which the reaction of the Jews who have heard Paul is described (cf. vv. 24–25).

13 Cf. also Luke 21:18 parr. Is the agreement coincidental?

There the apostle has cited the famous testimony of Isaiah 6:9f. concerning the obstinacy of Israel and proclaimed how God's salvation is now available to the heathen. In this way, at the end of the book the reader is very effectively reminded of what is shown repeatedly in this writing, and not with words of his own construction but presaged by Scripture. Here the concern is with human obstinacy and God's salvation. What Paul has said here, according to Luke, is not a simple description or statement of fact; no, here the concern is with the ultimate questions, with the decisive choice, with God's salvation. Here too it is clear that the words καὶ ταῦτα αὐτοῦ εἰπόντος reflect on the preceding heavily-charged declaration by the apostle.

Although the phrase ταῦτα εἰπών does not occur as frequently in Luke as in John, then, he still seems to know and use it. And indeed in exactly the same way: it is always preceded by a saying of great, crucial importance, and this addition gives the saying special emphasis.

It is notable that Luke applies this emphasis not only after typically "Christian" words but also according to Acts 19:41 in a "profane" connection.

The question why Luke, if the above is correct, does not make more use of this phrase in passages where statements of similarly great importance are made, is impossible to answer, because the decision as to its use or non-use belongs to the liberty of the author. It may be pointed out, however, that the parallel expression ταῦτα λέγων is also found a number of times in the Gospel (see 8:8;¹⁴ 9:34; 11:53 [variant]; 13:17), where the same phenomenon can be observed. As regards the two Acts variants we have discussed, we may note the following. If we assume—as is very commonly done—that later additions (from the 2nd century?) are found here, then it is striking that the reviser of the text was entirely *au fait* with the way in which one could and should apply such an expression. Now it was, as we have seen, not used so consistently by Luke that one can speak of a typically Lukan stylistic figure. And this brings us necessarily to a further question.

Before we turn to that question, however, two observations are in order:

- a) It is a stylistic figure which is of course at home specifically in narrative texts; it cannot be expected in letters (except if a story were to be woven into it); the *corpus Paulinum* therefore does not present any examples of it.
- b) In the Septuagint I have, to date, found only one single text which applies the expression, namely in 2 Macc 3:34: the temple-desecrator Heliodorus has

14 After the explanation of the Parable of the Sower: ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνει κτλ.; this use here is in fact odd, because the meaning is "after He had said this" and one expects: ταῦτα εἰπών. It is therefore understandable that some manuscripts (see K. Aland, *ad loc.*, n. 175), omit these words.

received a severe thrashing at the hands of heavenly messengers and learns from them that God will spare his life because of a peace offering which the high priest Onias has brought, but that he must announce his experience and the majestic power of God; this is followed by: ταῦτα δὲ εἰπόντες the messengers vanished. Bearing in mind that this is about the mighty Syrian general who is guilty of the serious offence of temple-desecration and must also publicly proclaim his humiliation but also the power of Israel's God, at the command of angels in fact, then it is evident that here too we are dealing with a saying that is weighty in content.

But beyond this we do not meet the expression in the Septuagint—unless one includes the so-called Fourth Book of Maccabees, where a few more cases are indeed found:

- 4 Macc 6:30: after the arch-martyr Eleazar has pronounced the request that his death should be a peace offering,¹⁵ καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν the holy man died nobly of his tortures.
- 4 Macc 9:10: the Jewish young men have not been distracted from their loyalty to the Law by seductive words, but on the contrary have stood up to the tyrant who was persecuting them; in an address they give expression to their resolve, sure that they will gain the reward for their loyalty, while the persecutor can expect eternal damnation (9:1–9); ταῦτα αὐτῶν εἰπόντων the tyrant flew into a rage.
- 4 Macc 9:25: the tortured youth calls on his brother to follow him and calls down heavenly vengeance on the tyrant; καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν the holy youth gave up his spirit.
- 4 Macc 11:17: the youngest-but-one of the seven brothers whose martyrdom is described and glorified, says that he wants to follow the same path as his brothers and having seen the torments of his brothers calls on his persecutors to torture him too; ταῦτα αὐτὸν εἰπόντα they took him away to the wheel.¹⁶

It is evident that in this work too the expression ταῦτα εἰπὼν follows statements that are of key importance for the message of the book: the significance of the martyrdom, the indefatigable courage towards the tyrant and in the face of

¹⁵ See the notes by M. Hadas, *The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees*, New York 1953, 181.

¹⁶ We might add 4 Macc 9:19, following the reading of Codex Sinaiticus, where the other mss. read: ταῦτα λέγοντι. This is preceded by the declaration by the eldest of the brothers who is tortured first; in this he states that the tortures will not help to dissuade him from his decision, because he will prove that μόνοι παῖδες Ἑβραίων ὑπὲρ ἀρετῆς εἰσιν ἀνίκητοι.

the tortures, the significance of keeping faithfully to the Law, the certainty of God's eternal reward and punishment.

Although the verb εἰπεῖν is common in various forms in the Septuagint,¹⁷ the phrase we are looking for is not found there. There is therefore no influence from there.¹⁸ Is it coincidental that the only instance is found in the strongly Hellenising (and not translated from Hebrew) book 2 Maccabees? On the other hand it is certainly noticeable that precisely in 4 Maccabees, that glorification of martyrdom for the sake of the Law in the gentile world, a book that in form so closely fits a genre from Hellenistic literature,¹⁹ we find four (effectively five) instances.

The indications that emerge from the material presented above lead us, thirdly, to enquire whether the phrase also occurs elsewhere with a similar application. Here it is natural that we should ask the historians. And here we are in the fortunate situation that we can consult a contemporary of Luke and John—retaining their traditional names for the sake of convenience—, namely Flavius Josephus.

The expression is indeed commonly found in his work, which is not surprising in the extensive oeuvre of the Jewish historian. It would take us too far to give a complete survey here, so we shall content ourselves with listing a number of examples:

Ant. Jud. I 103: after God has given the promise not to subject the earth again to a deluge and has set the rainbow in the sky as a sign of that (100–103).

Ant. Jud. II 166: after Joseph has finally revealed himself to his brothers in a long address and has invited them to settle in Egypt (161–165).

Ant. Jud. II 287: when Moses has proved his superiority over the Egyptian magicians and declared that his miracles take place through God's providence and power (285).

17 See E. Hatch & H.A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*, Oxford 1897, vol. I, 384–401: no fewer than 17 three-column pages!

18 The situation here is therefore different, for example, from that with the introductory formula τὰδε λέγει, which occurs both in the LXX and in Hellenistic literature as a solemn introduction to decrees or divine language; cf. E. Lohmeyer, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, Tübingen 21953, ad Rev 2:1.

19 See the excellent article by J.C.H. Lebram, "Die literarische Form des vierten Makkabäerbuches", *VigChr* 28 (1974), 81–96.

- Ant. Jud.* III 89: when Moses returns from Mount Sinai he gives a long address, not mentioned in Exodus, to the people, to tell them that he is coming to bring them God's Law, as a sign of God's care for the people and its continuing existence (84–88).
- Ant. Jud.* IV 150: after the ungodly address by Zimri, who was inciting the people to revolt against the Lawgiver Moses (145–149).²⁰
- Ant. Jud.* IV 194: in conclusion to the extensive farewell speech by Moses to the people, in which he spurs them to remain ever true to God's Law (180–193).
- Ant. Jud.* V 239: after the account of Jothan's fable (236–239).
- Ant. Jud.* VI 92: when Samuel has protested against Israel's desire to have a king (88–91, cf. 1 Sam 12:7).
- Ant. Jud.* VIII 118: after Solomon has pronounced his prayer at the dedication of the temple (111–117).
- Ant. Jud.* VIII 229: Jeroboam seduces the people with an address encouraging them to worship the idols in Bethel and Dan (227–228).
- Ant. Jud.* IX 263: when Hezekiah has announced his reform (261–262).
- Ant. Jud.* XI 336: after Alexander the Great has explained why he worshipped the Jewish high priest, dressed in the turban on which God's name was written, realising that his conquests were directed by God's guidance (333–335).
- Ant. Jud.* XVIII 78: Mendus has revealed the secret that he has seduced Paulina under the guise of the god Anubis (77).
- Ant. Jud.* XVIII 186: of Tiberius, who has exclaimed: "Let the gods know that it is not according to my own decision but at the urging of Antonia that I will do what I am going to do."
- Ant. Jud.* XVIII 284: after an important speech by Petronius, who dares to resist Caligula's command to desecrate the temple of Jerusalem by setting up an image of the emperor (279–283). One needs to read the story in its entirety to see the extent to which the existence of the Jewish people was at risk here.
- Ant. Jud.* XVIII 338: a Parthian king gives a Jew a clandestine warning in order to save his life (337).
- Ant. Jud.* XX 123: after a call to people to come to their senses and not to risk land, temple and families in a pointless revolt.

20 See my article: "Josephus' Account of the Story of Israel's Sin with Alien Women in the Country of Midian (Num. 25:1ff.)," in: *Travels in the World of the Old Testament. Studies presented to Prof. M.A. Beek on the occasion of his 65th birthday*, Assen 1974, 254–259.

This choice from the available material has been made at random and is not—needless to say—a biased selection. It seems clear from the examples given, that in Josephus too the phrase *ταῦτα εἰπών* always follows a speech or statement that is of crucial significance for the life of the community or the individual.

Josephus does not always conclude such speeches with *this* expression. In many cases there is no such link at all. But when he did use it he had a whole series of options, for instance to make the transition with a word like “afterwards”, “subsequently”; he sometimes uses *ταῦτα λέγων* or such expressions as “thus he spoke (argued)”, “thus he spoke, moved by the spirit” etc. It seems that he really did not let the phrase *ταῦτα εἰπών* flow automatically from his pen, but that he had a good eye for the specific character of the speeches which he wove into his account and adapted his transitions accordingly. It would go far beyond the limits of this essay to subject the transition formulae to a comparative study, however instructive this might be in itself. But the above should be sufficient to show that to an ancient author, the apparently simple phrase *ταῦτα εἰπών* evidently had a “hallmark”, giving a signal to the reader that the preceding speech contained a saying of far-reaching significance. We may add, however, that a clear distinction is evident between the expressions *ταῦτα λέγων* and *ταῦτα εἰπών*, in that the former shines a light on simultaneity, while the latter clearly indicates that the preceding is concluded.

Josephus is no exception in this usage. It emerges, if one investigates further, that he stands in a particular line of ancient historians.

As evidence for this view I would point to two historiographers who, as is generally assumed, had an influence on his style, namely Thucydides and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. In their work too one finds this expression repeatedly, after an important saying or significant speech has been delivered. Within the available space I have to be content with references without outlining the preceding argumentation. As examples we may then list in Thucydides I 7.34; II 3.35, 50; 4.18; III 5.16; VI 3.10 and in Dionysius Hal., *Ant. Rom.* III 7.7; 9.1; 21.7; V 10.1; VI 30.3; 39.1; 42.1; 25.1; 57.1; 67.1; 19.1; VII 8.1; 34.1; 36.4 (the latter passage presents a splendid parallel to Acts 19:40: *ταῦτα εἰπών διέλυσε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*).²¹

21 The parallel is striking, as one can see; cf. also *Ant. Rom.* VIII 4.2 *ταῦτα εἰπών . . . διέλυσε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*. But of course one cannot say on the basis of these texts that Luke has read Dionysius Hal.'s *Antiquitates Romanae* or, as some scholars immediately think, that both of them have used a particular *topos*. A gathering of people was simply called *ἐκκλησία* in Greek and it would be sent home or closed in due time. In the period of Antiquity that we can oversee, there countless numbers of such gatherings were held that followed the same procedure. Our football reporters do not make use of *topoi* either because in large numbers they speak of the keeper, a sweeper or a striker! This linguistic usage is given

For the sake of good order we should note that these examples can give a clear picture of the usage; completeness (let alone frequency statistics) is of no concern here, since the topics treated by the authors mentioned are so diverse and the extent of their oeuvre as preserved is so totally different.

In conclusion, then, we observe that whenever John uses the phrase ταῦτα εἰπών, he is not applying a rather silly, somewhat matter-of-fact transition formula but is following literary usage current in Antiquity. This phrase was used to underline clearly that the preceding words carried special weight for the life of the audience.

This is, it seemed to us, also always the case in the Fourth Gospel. Out of various options with their varied nuances this one was chosen in precisely the right way. And it is striking that John uses it so frequently! In itself the phrase ταῦτα εἰπών after a saying or speech does not seem so special, but in the light of ancient usage it does indeed gain a character of its own. From a methodological point of view this comparison is of significance, in my view, because it is a warning that even “self-evidences” merit a separate examination from a linguistic point of view.

If the conclusion of the preceding investigation is correct, then a new task arises from it, namely to reinvestigate the Fourth Gospel not only for its vocabulary but also for its syntactic and idiomatic aspects. The results of that study can be of significance for the determination of the milieu in which this Gospel was written.

Finally a further comment on the translation problem that resides in this idiom. If we have established that the phrase ταῦτα εἰπών gives a very particular, heavy accent to the preceding words, we cannot really be content with such a rendering as “with these words” or “when he had said that”, because the words “these” and “that” sound to us much less momentous in such a transition formula, unless we give particular emphasis by accentuation in the voice in the reading (“*that*”). To do justice to the full meaning contained in the Greek text, there is no escaping a rendering with the introduction of an adjective or a paraphrase, depending on the situation, or the placing of a note to indicate the proper accent. From this example it will be clear that a dynamic-equivalent translation does not entail a flattening or loosening, as is sometimes erroneously suggested, but precisely draws out the full meaning which remains hidden in a “literal” translation, because the “*vis verborum*” is no longer the same to us as to the readers and hearers in the ancient world.

with the situation described and not in the first instance as a result of rhetorical mores. One wishes that some NT scholars would realise this!

The Interpretation of Romans 12:8:

ὁ μεταδιδούς ἐν ἀπλότητι

Many Christians all over the world, now and in the future, owe an enormous debt of gratitude to Dr. Nida. They will not know it, because his name is not on the title page or in the colophon of the Bible translation they have in hand. But his spirit has helped and guided the minds and hands of those who labored to make the Bible available to each man in his own tongue in the present generation. By his many seminars, lectures, and books Dr. Nida has put his great learning in linguistics at the disposal of others; he has made his gifts a source of inspiration in many parts of the globe. His T(E)APOT¹ is a classic for all those who are struggling on the long and often rough path between the original text and the expression of its meaning in the vernacular.

Dr. Nida's name is closely associated with that method of translation called "dynamic equivalence". Hence, it seemed appropriate to discuss in his honor a little problem by which some of the difficulties encountered by a translator may be demonstrated. Has the last word been said when we have given a dynamic equivalence translation?

Some time ago in reading a report of a conference devoted to this method of translating I came across a sentence that made me wonder. In November 1972 a meeting was held in Argenteuil, Belgium, under the guidance of some men who have good names in Bible work, viz. Dr. H.R. Weber, Rev. Kassühlke, and Rev. Fueter. The report said:

The Principles of Dynamic Equivalence translation were studied, and *their bearing on the interpretation of the Bible discussed.*²

The latter half of the sentence puzzled me. My troubles may result from the brevity of this report, but I am not sure of that. At any rate in my understanding dynamic equivalence translation is a *method* of reproducing the understanding of the Hebrew or Greek original of the Bible in another language, not by word-for-word translation, but by the expression in the idiom of the receiving language. The translation, any translation, is based on exegesis; it is "exegesis

1 E.A. Nida and C.R. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (Leiden, 1969).

2 *United Bible Societies, Bulletin* 93 (1973), 44 (italics are mine).

in a nutshell", as was already discovered more than a century ago.³ Our interpretation, even if we have only a translation in hand, does not depend on the principles of translation, but on the basic exegesis. Now it may be that what the report quoted wanted to say was that a dynamic equivalence translation is a much better way to bring out the basic meaning of the original text than a so-called literal translation. But that is not clearly stated. However that may be, without sound exegesis, dynamic equivalence translation would be less than "a noisy gong or a clanging bell" (I Cor. 13: 1, TEV). Nevertheless, it may be that even an excellent translation made according to this principle must remain unclear, since the original text is ambiguous. In that case footnotes are indispensable. This too, however, can only be decided on the basis of the exegesis of the original text in Hebrew or Greek.

In this paper we will discuss a little problem of this sort because it offers a good specimen of the difficulties one may encounter.

The text that is offered here for translation consists of only four words, Rom. 12:8 ὁ μεταδιδούς ἐν ἀπλότῃτι. At first sight it does seem rather simple and without great puzzles.

A representative though incomplete conspectus of English translations may be helpful:

A. V.: "he that giveth, *let him do it* with simplicity"

Rev. V.: "he that giveth, *let him do it* with liberality"

Weymouth: "he who gives should be liberal"

Moffatt: "the contributors must be liberal"

R. S. V.: "he who contributes, in liberality"

Barrett: "the man who practises charity, let him do it whole-heartedly"

N. E. B.: "if you give to charity, give with all your heart"

TEV: "Whoever shares what he has with others, must do it generously"

Similar lists of translations in other languages could be made⁴ but would be of little help in this paper. It is evident that there are two vital points in this part of the verse, namely the exact meanings of μεταδιδούς and ἀπλότης.

3 W.C. van Maanen, *Het Nieuwe Testament sedert 1859* (Groningen, 1886), 36, wrote about the Dutch translation of G. Vissering (2nd ed., 1859): "The extremely modest form . . . in which the result of profound exegetical research has been embodied . . . a peculiar and yet complete exegetical-critical commentary on the New Testament" (my translation).

4 As far as I can see, all *suggest* by their phraseology that Paul enjoins the distribution of material gifts, though the Dutch translation of the Bible Society with the word "wie mededeelt" is equivocal, for it may be "who distributes" or "who informs".

The decision on the first point seems to be quite simple, for with the exception of Moffatt and RSV all translators seem to have based themselves on the same interpretation of μεταδιδούς though their reproduction in English may be somewhat different.

Moffatt and R.S.V. let Paul have a man in view who contributes to the church⁵ and quickens his generosity. In itself this is a useful exhortation; it may have been as appropriate in the beginnings of the church as it is at present. But I wonder if this is the proper meaning of μεταδιδόναί. Up until now I have not found any Greek texts, where the word is used for contributions made to clubs, etc., which would substantiate this explanation.

The interpretation that is practically unanimously accepted,⁶ goes in quite another direction: "it refers to a rich man who liberally gave his wealth in alms",⁷ or, to quote Fitzmeyer, this "gift is that of philanthropy and differs from the second [sc. the *diakonia*, verse 7] because he is moved to dispense his private wealth".⁸ In former times some commentators had thought of sharing spiritual gifts, but Bernhard Weiss, who mentions it, flatly rejects this opinion because it does not fit the context.⁹ In the present century it was, as far as I know, only the great Theodor Zahn who held the view that Paul had both spiritual gifts and material goods in mind; a limitation to the latter category was not justified.¹⁰ Nevertheless, the overwhelming majority of commentators did not follow this line. Lagrange, while admitting that the verb may have both meanings, chooses for the latter because the spiritual sharing is already mentioned by teaching and exhortation; "il s'agit donc de l'aumône".¹¹ If the need is felt to define the verb μεταδιδόναί somewhat more explicitly, it is explained in the way of Sanday-Headlam: "the man who gives alms of his own substance" (μεταδιδούς = who gives of his own, in contrast with διαδιδούς = who distributes other persons' gifts).¹² It would be a waste of paper to draw up a long list of exegetes, because

5 J. Knox, "Romans", in *The Interpreter's Bible* 9 (Nashville, New York, 1954), 585.

6 See e.g. Severianus of Gabala in K. Staab, *Pauluskommentareaus der griechischen Kirche* (Münster, 1933), 223, who sees here a consequence of Jesus' saying Luke 6:30.

7 A.E. Garvie, "Romans", in *The Century Bible* (Edinburgh, n.d.), 262.

8 J.A. Fitzmeyer, "Romans", in *The Jerome Biblical Commentary* 2 (London, 1968), 325.

9 B. Weiss, *Brief des Paulus an die Römer*, 7th ed. (Göttingen, 1886), 581.

10 T. Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*, 3rd ed. (Leipzig, Erlangen, 1925), 547; H.W. Schmidt, *Den Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (Berlin, 1962), 212, mentions the view of Zahn, but prefers the view of almsgiving.

11 M.J. Lagrange, *Saint Paul, Épître aux Romains* (Paris, 1950), 300.

12 W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 5th ed. (Edinburgh, 1902), 357. Calvin had held the other view: "Per μεταδιδόντας . . . non eos intelligit qui largiuntur de suo; sed Diaconos, qui publicis Ecclesiae facultatibus dispensendis praesunt".

in all present-day commentaries the same opinion, expressed in a variety of wordings, is found: Paul speaks of almsgiving or giving to the poor.¹³ The added annotation of Hugo Grotius who took it as an injunction to the rich is interesting: “Est quidem opulentia bonum temporale, sed cum in usus pauperum confertur, fit spirituale.”

For the explanation in the sense of almsgiving the following parallel texts are given by Lietzmann:¹⁴

- (a) Luke 3:11 in the speech of John the Baptist: ὁ ἔχων δύο χιτῶνας μεταδότω τῷ μὴ ἔχοντι.
- (b) Eph. 4:18: the thief should not steal anymore, but work with his own hands, ἵνα ἔχῃ μεταδιδόναι τῷ χρεῖαν ἔχοντι.
- (c) Hermas, Vis. III 9, 2.4: καὶ μὴ μόνον τὰ κτίσματα τοῦ θεοῦ μεταλαμβάνετε ἐκ κατχύματος,¹⁵ ἀλλὰ μεταδίδετε καὶ τοῖς ὑστερουμένοις... αὕτη οὖν ἡ ἀσυνκρασία βλαβερά ὑμῖν τοῖς ἔχουσιν καὶ μὴ μεταδιδούσιν τοῖς ὑστερουμένοις.

Sometimes references to LXX are added:

- (1) Job 31:17: εἰ δὲ καὶ τὸν ψωμόν μου ἔφαγον μόνος καὶ οὐχὶ ὀρφανῷ μετέδωκα.
- (2) Prov. 11:26: ὁ συνέχων σίτον ὑπολίποιτο αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εὐλογία δὲ εἰς κεφαλὴν τοῦ μεταδιδόντος.
- (3) Epist. Jeremiae 27: οὔτε πτωχῷ οὔτε ἀδυνάτῳ μεταδιδόασιν.

See also in Test. XII Patr.

Issaschar 7:5: πτωχῷ μετέδωκα ἄρτον μου.

Zebulon 6:4: ἐκ τῆς θήρας μου παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ ξένῳ σπλαγχνιζόμενος μετεδίδουν.

13 A special interpretation was given by Martin Luther, *Vorlesung über den Römerbrief* 1515–1516, 4th ed., edited by E. Ellwein (München, 1957), 384–386; he mentions the giving of the subjects to their superiors and vice versa, and continues: “Aber diese Auslegung empfiehlt sich nicht. Der Apostel redet vielmehr von jenem Geben, das den Lehrern des Wortes und den Leitern zugute kommt”, referring to Galatians 6:6.

14 H. Lietzmann, *An die Römer*, 3rd ed. (Tübingen, 1928), 109.

15 W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*, 5th ed. (Berlin, 1958), Sp. 832, s.v.: “aus d. Brühe fischen d. h. alles für sich ergattern”.

The second question is concerned with the meaning of ἀπλότης.¹⁶

It is usual to refer to other Pauline texts:

- (1) 2 Cor. 8:2: ὅτι ἐν πολλῇ δοκιμῇ θλίψεως ἢ περισσεΐα τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτῶν καὶ ἡ κατὰ βᾶθους πτωχεΐα αὐτῶν ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς ἀπλότητος αὐτῶν.
- (2) 2 Cor. 9:11: ἐν παντὶ πλουτιζόμενοι εἰς πᾶσαν ἀπλότητα, ἥτις κατεργάζεται δι' ἡμῶν εὐχαριστίαν τῷ θεῷ.
- (3) 2 Cor. 9:13: διὰ τῆς δοκιμῆς τῆς διακονίας ταύτης δοξάζοντες τὸν θεὸν ἐπὶ τῇ . . . ἀπλότητι τῆς κοινωνίας εἰς αὐτοὺς καὶ εἰς πάντας.
- (4) 2 Cor. 11:3: φοβοῦμαι δὲ μὴ πῶς, ὥς ὁ ὄφεις ἐξηπάτησεν Εὐάν ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτοῦ, φθαρῇ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπλότητος καὶ τῆς ἀγνότητος τῆς εἰς Χριστόν.

It is often taken in the sense of “singleness of purpose and not with mixed motives, with the thought of ostentation or reward”;¹⁷ “wholeheartedly . . . being without *arrière-pensée* in one's gifts”.¹⁸ Others translate it with reference to the above New Testament texts as “liberality” or “generosity”.¹⁹ Sanday and Headlam draw special attention to the Test. XII Patr. Issaschar in which this patriarch is painted as an example of the virtue.²⁰

Of course this interpretation gives a perfectly good sense if, and only if, the verb μεταδιδόναι has the implicit and unequivocal meaning of “to give to the poor”. But is that so? Or have we in following this line more or less fallen victim to a certain exegetical tradition?

It is quite clear that the verb in question is used in connection with helping the poor in the texts cited before. But that idea is mentioned *expressis verbis* and does not seem to be implied in the verb itself.

Modern linguistics has taught us, insofar as we did not know it before, that words do not “have” meanings, but that they derive their meanings from their contexts. We translate not words but sentences and wider contexts. The trouble

16 O. Bauernfeind, in G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* 1 (Stuttgart, 1933), 385–386 and J. Amstutz, *ΑΠΛΟΤΗΣ, eine begriffsgeschichtliche Studie zum jüdisch—christlichen Griechisch*, Bonn 1960, who follows 108 f., the common explanation of “almsgiving”; ἀπλότης = “in spontaner Freiheit und ohne bekümmertes Sorgen”.

17 Sanday and Headlam, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 357.

18 C.K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (London, 1957), 238–239.

19 J.B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. James*, 3rd ed. (London, 1910), 39; and J.H. Ropes, *Epistle of St. James* (Edinburg, 1916), 139–140 ad Jac. 1:5 παρὰ τοῦ διδόντος θεοῦ πᾶσιν ἀπλῶς.

20 See the notes of R.H. Charles, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Translated from the Editor's Greek text*, (London, 1908), 103–105.

with the present text is that it is so extremely brief and lends itself to many interpretations, because the verb in question is used in a wide variety of “contexts”, as we shall see presently.

This fact is made clear by Paul himself, for there are two more texts in his letters that may not pass unnoticed if we want to discuss our text without prejudice. The first is Rom. 1:11:

ἐπιποθῶ γὰρ ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς, ἵνα τι μεταδῶ χάρισμα ὑμῖν πνευματικόν εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς, 12 τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν συμπαρακληθῆναι ἐν ὑμῖν διὰ τῆς ἐν ἀλλήλοις πίστεως ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ.

This text, though it is hardly mentioned in connection with Rom. 12:8, is, I think, extremely relevant because the object here is χάρισμα πνευματικόν and in Rom. 12:6 Paul is also speaking of the different, *charismata*, one of which shows itself in ὁ μεταδιδούς. From this activity will result the strengthening of the Roman Christians or better, as Paul corrects himself, a mutual comfort through that faith which they and he have in common. This μεταδιδόναι does not only help the faithful in Rome, but also the apostle.

The second text stands in a missionary context, viz. 1 Thess. 2:8 οὕτως ὁμιρούμενοι ὑμῶν ἡὺδοκοῦμεν μεταδοῦναι ὑμῖν οὐ μόνον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυχάς.²¹ Paul has reminded the Thessalonians in what spirit he has preached the Gospel among them without error, guile, flattering, or greed, without seeking glory from men.²² Then he argues that he has not made demands, but was gentle as a nurse.²³ Μεταδοῦναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον is paralleled in this passage by λαλήσαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (verse 2) and ἐκηρύξαμεν . . . τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (verse 9). But Paul did not only talk about the Gospel: this μεταδοῦναι is more, not an outward message, but his own person.²⁴ This is shown by his labor with his own hands,²⁵ wherewith he demonstrates his independence, and, even more important, was able not to make demands on them.

21 B. Rigaux, *Saint Paul, Les Épîtres aux Thessaloniens* (Paris, Gembloux, 1956), 422, was correct in pointing out the difference with δοῦναι or τιθέναι τὴν ψύχην in John 10:11; 1 John 3:16, Mark 10:45 = to offer one's life = to die.

22 For these negative qualifications cf. M. Dibelius, *An die Thessalonicher I, II, An die Philipper*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen, 1925), 7–8, criticism of traveling preachers (“Wandellehrer der Zeit”).

23 See A.J. Malherbe, “Gentle as a Nurse”, in *Novum Testamentum XII* (1970), 203–217.

24 ψυχή as a reflexive noun, cf. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*, Sp. 1767, s.v. f.

25 This is an often recurring theme in Paul's letters, cf. also 2 Thess. 3:8; 1 Cor. 4:12; 9:15; and in his “testament” according to Acts 20:34.

Of course, in the line of thinking that used to speak of the “poor heathen”, it might be possible to give the verb μεταδοῦναι the notion of “giving to the poor” in a spiritual sense. But that interpretation would run counter to the rest of the sentence, where Paul is not thinking of people who are in need, but of those on whom he could have made demands as an apostle. Besides that, as will appear presently, the combination of μεταδιδόναι with the Gospel is not so strange in Greek ears as it would appear at first sight.

We see from these texts that the verb has a much wider meaning for Paul than in the first set of texts (p. 172), that it can be used to express an essential element in his relation to his fellow believers, and that it is even wider than “to preach” but could also comprise the giving of oneself in it.

It may also be worthwhile to have a look at the Septuagint. The concordance of Hatch and Redpath shows that μεταδιδόναι does not have a prominent place in the vocabulary of the Greek Old Testament. Besides the texts already cited (p. 172), where the context gives a mark of aiding the poor to the verb, note four more:

- (1) 2 Macc. 1:35: καὶ οἷς ἐχαρίζετο ὁ βασιλεύς (sc. of the Persians) πολλὰ διαφορὰ ἐλάμβανεν καὶ μετεδίδου. Tedesche translated it this way: “the king then exchanged all kinds of gifts with those whom he wished to favor” and gave this correct explanation: “an oriental custom expressing satisfaction and pleasure”.²⁶
- (2) 2 Macc. 8:12: the Jewish leader Judas hears the news of the advances of his enemy καὶ μεταδόντος τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ στρατοπέδου, the cowards fled. Here it means “to pass on, to intimate the news”.
- (3) Tob. 7:10 (text of the manuscripts B.A., not in S): μετέδωκεν τὸν λόγον τῷ ‘Ραγουηλ· this is the answer to Tobias’ question: ἀλήγησον ὑπὲρ ὧν ἔλεγες ἐν τῇ πορείᾳ.²⁷
- (4) Wisd. of Sol. 7:13 in a hymn on Wisdom: ἀδόλως τε ἔμαθον ἀφθόνως τε μεταδίδωμι. τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῆς οὐκ ἀποκρύπτομαι. Though the verb is used here without additions, the context makes it clear that the object here is Wisdom. The use of μεταδιδόναι in this context is not peculiar to the unknown author of the “Book of Wisdom”, but it reflects current

²⁶ It is impossible to go into the investigation of this custom in this paper.

²⁷ See also Test. XII Patr., Dan. 6:9 καὶ ἃ ἠκούσατε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν, μετάδοτε καὶ ὑμεῖς τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν. Letter of Aristes 43 in a letter of the Jewish High Priest to the Egyptian King about the ambassadors the king has sent καὶ μετέδωκαν ἡμῖν τὰ παρὰ σου, viz. message and presents. Testamentum Job 4:1 ὑποδείκνυμί σοι πάντα ἅπερ ἐνετείλατό μοι κύριος μεταδιδόναι σοι.

usage. The text and other relevant material has been discussed in a special study, to which the interested readers may be referred.²⁸ By way of illustration some of the most telling parallels may be quoted:

- (1) an inscription of Samos (± 200 B.C.) in honor of a teacher μεταδιδούς ἀφθόνως τῆς καθ' αὐτὸν παιδείας τοῖς βουλομένοις μετέχειν.
- (2) ps. Aristoteles, *De Mundo* 391a, where it is said about the philosophical soul πᾶσιν ἀφθόνως μεταδοῦναι βουλευθεῖσα τῶν παρ' αὐτῇ τιμίων.²⁹
- (3) Dio Chrysostomus, *Or.* 41,9: Rome has been more superior than other men ἐπεικεῖα καὶ φιλανθρωπία. τοῦτο μὲν ἀφθόνως μεταδιδούσα καὶ πολιτείας καὶ νόμων καὶ ἀρχῶν . . . τοῦτο δὲ ὁμοίως ἅπασι φυλάττουσα τὸ δίκαιον.
- (4) Hippolytus, *De Antichristo* 29, after an explanation of the statue in Daniel 2: ταῦτά σοι, ἀγαπητέ, μετὰ φόβου μεταδίδομεν ἀφθόνως.

It would surpass the limits set to this paper if we were to reproduce the whole collection of texts using the verb μεταδιδόναι that I have brought together. But from this material it appears that μεταδιδόναι is seldomly connected with giving to people in need; even where it is used of presents, it may also be said of giving to the rich.³⁰ The verb has a much wider radius of action than just giving to the poor.

This negative statement may be supplemented by a positive observation: the giving always involves something important which enriches life in this world

28 W.C. van Unnik, "ΑΦΘΩΝΩΣ ΜΕΤΑΔΙΔΩΜΙ", in *Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België* (= *Klasse der Letteren* 23:4) (Brussel, 1971), quoted in this paper as "Aphthonoos".

29 Cf. van Unnik, "Aphthonoos", 14–17, for a discussion of these texts.

30 Xenophon, *Anab.* IV 5,6, some soldiers have lighted fires, but do not admit fellow soldiers εἰ μὴ μεταδοῖεν αὐτοῖς πυρούς ἢ ἄλλο, εἴ τι ἔχοιεν βρωτῶν. ἔνθα δὴ μεταδίδουσιν ἀλλήλοις, ὧν εἶχον ἕκαστοι. Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* VIII 175, of the Queen of Sheba τυχοῦσα καὶ μεταδοῦσα πάλιν τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν παρ' αὐτῆς. *Ant. Jud.* IX 59, Elisha συνεβούλευσε δὲ ξενίων αὐτοῖς (sc. the soldiers of the enemy) μεταδόντα καὶ τραπέζης ἀπολύειν ἀβλαβεῖς. Even the poor can do it, see Dio Chrysostomus, *Orat.* VII 82, the poor πολλάκις δὲ καὶ μεταδιδόντας ὧν ἔχουσιν ἐτοιμότερον than the rich, which is illustrated in § 83 with an example from Homer. In a definition of Chrysippus (ap. J. ab Arnim, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* [Lipsiae, 1903], 169–170) of the ἀγροίκος: εἶναι δὲ καὶ ἀχάριστον, οὔτε πρὸς ἀνταπόδεσιν χάριτος οἰκείως ἔχοντα οὔτε πρὸς μετάδοσιν διὰ τὸ μῆτε κοινῶς τι ποιεῖν μῆτε φιλικῶς μῆτε ἀμελετήτως. Here it means to share with others spontaneously. In Stoic ethics it has no special place.

such as the fruits of the earth,³¹ land, honor, citizenship,³² or is something necessary for future salvation. With regard to this latter aspect it may be said that it is almost a *terminus technicus* for the communication of the teaching of salvation which is hidden from the masses, but in the possession of special initiated teachers.³³ Some special “treasure” is involved; hence in many texts a contrast

31 Cf. Diodorus Sic., *Hist. Gen.* IV 1, 7, on the benefit given by Dionysius καὶ τὰ περὶ τὴν φυτείαν τῆς ἀμπέλου φιλοτεχνήσαντα μεταδοῦναι τῆς τοῦ οἴνου χρήσεως τοῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀνθρώποις. V 67,2 of Demeter who commanded Tripto-lemos πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις μεταδοῦναι τῆς τε δωρεᾶς καὶ τὰ περὶ τὴν ἐργασίαν τοῦ σπόρου διδάξαι. In Philo's works many texts are found where God is the subject who gives man congeniality with Him, His nature, etc.; in a separate paper I hope to return to the use of μεταδίδοναι in the works of Philo.

32 Land: Herodotus, *Hist.* IV 145; rule: Herodotus, *Hist.* VII 150; Plato, *Leg.* 715 a; honor: Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* X 249; citizenship: Lysias, *Or.* 25,3, Diodorus Sic., *Hist. Gen.* XIV 8,3, XIX 2,8; Dionysius Hal., *Ant. Rom.* IV 23, 2–4. Dio Chrysostomus, *Or.* 38,4, defends himself against various objections made by his audience which is unwilling to listen to him; one point they make is this: τί δὲ σεαυτῷ λόγον μεταδίδως οὐ σοὶ μὴ μετέδομεν ἡμεῖς; to which the orator answers, as follows in 38,5, τί τοῦτο δυσκόλῳ ἐστίν, ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ λόγου μεταδοῦναι βουλομένῳ ματὴν εἰπεῖν; here it has the meaning of “to give somebody the liberty to address the congregation”; this is clearly considered a privilege.

The verb is twice found in the writings of the Christian Apologists: Athenagoras, *Legatio* 30:2, “their subjects honoured them as gods” (τιμῆς μετεδίδοσαν); Justin Martyr, *Apologia* 66:3, about the Eucharist: the Apostles have handed down in the Gospels the command and the story of the institution καὶ μόνοις αὐτοῖς μεταδοῦναι (sc. bread and wine); cf. 66:1 the food, called *eucharistia* ἥς οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ μετασχεῖν ἐξόν ἐστίν ἢ τῷ πιστεύοντι. This case in Justin Martyr is significant to demonstrate that something precious is involved. Except for the texts mentioned on p. 172 and in note 33 below the verb does not occur in the Apostolic Fathers (I Clemens 20:9 μεταπαράδιδασιν ἀλλήλοις of the seasons “to give place to each other” is quite different).

33 An interesting series of texts will be found in O. Casel, *De Philosophorum graecorum silentiomystico* (Giessen, 1919), 5, 11, 31, 53, 56, 82, 94, 101, 103, 105–106, 113. It is often found in Magical Papyri for passing on the information in these books to other people. In van Unnik, “Aphthonoos”, *passim* I have also collected and discussed a good many texts which show the use of μεταδίδοναι with regard to religious teachings. For teaching see also Isocrates, *Or.* XIII, against teachers of political rhetoric ταύτης τῆς δυνάμεως οὐδὲν οὔτε ταῖς ἐμπειρίαις οὔτε τῇ φύσει τῇ τοῦ μαθητοῦ μεταδιδόσιν. We may also add here two important Christian texts: Barnabas 1:5 on his purpose ὅτι ἐὰν μελήσῃ μοι περὶ ὑμῶν τοῦ μέρους τι μεταδοῦναι ἀφ’ οὗ ἔλαβον... he was diligent to send something in order that they should have together with their faith perfect knowledge. Hippolytus, *De Antichristoi*, there is great danger that this teaching is entrusted to unbelievers and blasphemers; μετὰδος δὲ αὐτὰ εὐλαβέσι καὶ πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις, referring to Paul's words in I Tim. 6:20 ff., 2 Tim. 2:1 ff.; if the apostle was so careful, how greater risk shall we run εἰ ἀπλῶς καὶ ὥς ἔτυχεν τὰ θεοῦ λόγια μεταδώσωμεν βεβήλοις καὶ ἀναξίοις ἀνδράσιν.

is found μεταδιδόναι—οὐ φθονεῖν, that is to say the possessor should not guard it grudgingly, but put it freely at the disposition of others.³⁴

If we look for an English expression that covers all these various occurrences of the Greek verb, I would suggest: “to let another man share in something very precious one possesses”. It is not just giving, but sharing. In this way the status of the other man either for this world or for life eternal is raised.

In practically all texts, this precious thing (gift, status, knowledge) is fully expressed. Usually it is expressed in the genitive, sometimes in the accusative. The beneficiary is mentioned in the dative. There are some cases in which μεταδιδόναι is used in an absolute sense, but then the object is implied in the context; so in Polybius XXIX 27,4 after the king had read the letter ἔφη βούλεσθαι μεταδοῦναι τοῖς φίλοις περὶ τῶν προσπεπτωκότων and XXXVIII 8,1 τοῦ δὲ Γολόσσου μεταδόντος τῷ στρατηγῷ περὶ τῶν εἰρημένων,³⁵ it is to share information which is important for future events.

As was said before, the difficulty, almost unsurmountable in Rom. 12:8, is the fact that μεταδιδούς is used here without appositions in an absolute sense, and the context in this case does not offer any help, not even in an implicit way.

In the light of the material both in Paul and in Greek texts nothing compels us to think that μεταδιδόναι refers here particularly to almsgiving. Since in 1 Thess. 2:8 it stands parallel with λαλῆσαι (verse 2) and κηρύσσειν (verse 9) and the verb is frequently used by the Greeks for communication of revelations, it can also be taken in that sense. The argument of B. Weiss and Lagrange, viz. that “das geistliches Mittheilen bereits vorher in seinen besonderen Formen erledigt ist”,³⁶ does not carry weight. It should be noticed that μεταδιδόναι as an indication for communicating religious knowledge is something different from “teaching” and “comforting” and “prophecy”. In the Pauline epistles the Christian instruction has a great variety of forms, as may be easily seen from the apostle’s vocabulary (cf. e.g. the combination and difference of λόγος σοφίας and λόγος γνώσεως in 1 Cor. 12:8). And finally much depends on the way in which we construct Rom. 12:7–8 (see below).

34 See van Unnik, “Aphthonoos”, for the evidence.

35 Cf. H.G. Liddell, R. Scott and H. Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. (Oxford, 1940), III, s.v.

36 B. Weiss, *Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (see p. 171). But given this interpretation, it is not self-evident why later ὁ ἐλεῶν is mentioned, because this word is usually taken in the sense of a man who practises the “deeds of love” mentioned in rabbinical literature, see Barrett, *A Commentary*, 239. 2 Cor. 9:7 has the combination of cheerfulness with giving: ἱλαρὸν γὰρ δότην ἀγαπᾷ ὁ θεός, which is a reminiscence of Prov. 22:8 LXX, a passage in which also sowing and reaping are mentioned; this verse is followed in verse 9 ὁ ἐλεῶν πτωχόν (this expression also in Prov. 14:21, 19:17, 28:8).

It may be remarked that the word ἀπλότης agrees well with this conception of μεταδιδόναι = to communicate or share religious knowledge. The astrologue Vettius Valens, who has declared ἄφθονον τὴν μετάδοσιν ποιησόμεθα (IV 11, 172 Kroll), says in one of his autobiographical passages: ἄν πλειστάκις περὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ἄφθονίας καὶ ἀπλότητος ὑπομιμνήσκω (VII 5, 301).³⁷ The same combination is found in Ode of Solomon 7:3 (the Lord) “has shown Himself to me without grudging in His simplicity”.³⁸ Two texts in Barnabas are important. Barnabas 8:2 νοεῖτε πῶς ἐν ἀπλότῃ λέγει ὑμῖν, then follows the explanation of the Red Heifer (Num. 19:2 ff.). Cf. the note of Windisch:

will wohl sagen, dass es ein überaus einleuchtendes und leicht verständliches Mittel ist, an der Hand einer solchen Zeremonie die Geheimnisse der Erlösung darzustellen. . . .³⁹

Barnabas 17:1 ἐφ’ ὅσον ἦν ἐν δυνατῷ καὶ ἀπλότῃ δηλῶσαι ὑμῖν things that refer to salvation. The “simplicity” is the manner in which God’s mysteries are made plain to the believers.⁴⁰ In this way the *metadosis* of which the author has spoken in the beginning (1:5, cf. p. 177, n. 33) is given to the readers in simple terms. In this connection it is also interesting to read the following description of the apostolic preaching in Ps. Clem. Hom. I 11,4 οὐ γραμματικὴν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι τέχνην, ἀλλὰ ἀπλοῖς καὶ ἀπανούργοις⁴¹ λόγοις τὴν αὐτοῦ (of God)

37 See the evidence in van Unnik “Aphthonoos”, 39–46.

38 Translation of J. Rendel Harris and A. Mingana, *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon* 2 (Manchester, 1920), 240, and my discussion of this text in W.C. van Unnik, “De ἀφθονία van God in de oudchristelijke literatuur”, in *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen*, afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, deel 36, nr. 2 (Amsterdam, 1973), 7–8.

39 H. Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief* (Tübingen, 1920), 348.

40 See also 6:5 ἀπλούστερον ὑμῖν γράφω ἵνα συνιῇτε. In the text of Hippolytus, *De Antichristo* 1, quoted before p. 177, n. 33, ἀπλῶς is used in an unfavorable sense but that depends there on the context. With the meaning of “without further ado” it is often found in Greek literature.

41 Cf. Paul in 1 Thessalonians 2 for his preaching which is in sharp contrast with that of others; 2 Cor. 4:2 μὴ περιπατοῦντες ἐν πανουργίᾳ μηδὲ δολοῦτες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ and Eph. 4:14 ἐν πανουργίᾳ πρὸς τὴν μεθοδεῖαν τῆς πλάνης. Philo, *De Opif. mundi* 156, has an interesting combination though ἀπλότης is used here of simplicity of human character: after eating the fruit in Paradise τοῦτ’ ἐξαπιναιῖως ἀμφοτέρους ἐξ ἀκακίας καὶ ἀπλότητος ἡθῶν εἰς πανουργίαν μετέβαλεν. Cf also 2 Cor. 1:12 Paul’s boat is the witness of his conscience ὅτι ἐν ἀπλότῃ (var. ἀγιότητι) καὶ εἰλικρινείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ σαρκικῇ, ἀλλ’ ἐν χάριτι θεοῦ ἀνεστράφημεν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ.

βούλησιν ἐκφαίνοντες, ὡς πανθ' ὄντιναοὺν ἀκούσαντα νοεῖν τὰ λεγόμενα.⁴² Here the word ἀπλοῦς is used in a significant way in contrast with the rhetorical tricks which deceived men with words, which made the simple truth complicated and unintelligible; the gospel is preached in plain words, so that every man can understand it.

As is well known, the Christian mission had to find its way in a world in which there were many competing preachers of salvation, philosophers, sorcerers, adherents of mystery religions, astrologers, etc.; many gods and many ways to blessedness were revealed. The secrets were wrapped in darkness to be opened only to the initiated. When in this context the word ἀπλότης is used, it means the end of all veiled, secret truth; the preacher of the gospel should bring his message in plain words, so that all can understand it. So the word fits well the verb μεταδιδόναι in the sense of communicating the riches of the gospel.

This aspect of ἀπλότης is of course not the only one. The others that have been mentioned before (see p. 173) also make a good sense in this connection. Many of these preachers of religious knowledge enviously guarded their secrets; they were proud of their powerful possession that opened the doors to heavenly and earthly happiness. Had not Paul given the warning to the Corinthians that “knowledge puffs up” (I Cor. 8:1)? The apostle had good reasons to start the pericope of our text with the admonition (phrased in Greek with a rhetorical wordplay!): μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν, ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωρονεῖν (Rom. 12:3).⁴³

This brings us back to our starting point, Romans 12:8, and the whole passage of which it is a part.

In practically all editions and commentaries a new sentence starts at verse 6 ἔχοντες δέ.⁴⁴ I have often wondered why that is done; Lietzmann, for example,

42 See also Hermes Trismegistos XVI, where Hermes says of the Egyptian books in their original language δόξει τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσί μου τοῖς βιβλίοις ἀπλουστάτη εἶναι ἢ συντάξις καὶ σαφής, but through translation in Greek they have been spoilt and become unclear.

43 See ἀπλῶς in a long series of virtues Marcus Aurelius, *Eis Heauton* VI 30 τήρησον οὖν σεαυτὸν ἀπλοῦν, ἀγαθόν, ἀκέραιον, σεμνόν, ἄκομψον, τοῦ δικαίου φίλον, θεοσεβή, εὐμενῇ, φιλόστοργον, ἐρρωμένον πρὸς τὰ πρέποντα ἔργα. Cf. A. Bonhöffer, *Epiktet und das Neue Testament* (Giessen, 1911), 108.

44 *The Greek New Testament*, edited by K. Aland, M. Black, B.M. Metzger, A. Wikgren, has no annotation *in loco*, though it is always careful in registering all differences in punctuation. But Tischendorf in his *Novum Testamentum Graece* 2, ed. octava critica maior (Lipsiae, 1872), 430, and J.M.S. Baljon, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Groningae, 1898), 493, have a comma.

even had to supplement it with a fairly long addition⁴⁵ or ἔχοντες has to be taken as ἔχομεν. In my view the parallelism in verses 4 ff. points in another direction. Paul here applies to the church the famous image of the body with its different members⁴⁶ (cf. also 1 Corinthians 12). In verse 4 he makes three points: (a) the body is one, (b) the body has many members, and (c) not all members have the same function. How are these three points matched in the sequel? Verse 5 has: one body in Christ (a); individually members one of another (b); therefore point (c) would be left over, if it did not find its complete counterpart in verse 6a ἔχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθείσαν ἡμῖν διάφορα. It is this last point that the apostle wishes to stress here: unity in Christ is not uniformity, but variety in the gifts of the Spirit (cf. 1 Cor. 12:11 πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα, διαιροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἐκάστῳ καθὼς βουλέται). So the image and its parallelism demands that not a full stop be put behind verse 5, but a comma.

In verses 6b–8 Paul exemplifies these differences. Though there are agreements in terminology with other lists of charismata (1 Cor. 12:8–11; 1 Cor. 12:28; Eph. 4:11), the catalogues cannot be squared with each other in all details. The enumeration here in Romans distinctively has four items connected with polysyndeton, followed by three with asyndeton. According to Blass, Debrunner, and Funk

polysyndeton produces the impression of the extensiveness and abundance by means of an exhausting summary; asyndeton, by breaking up the series and introducing the items staccato fashion produces a vivid and impassioned effect.⁴⁷

Even more important, I would say, is the shift in emphasis, because in the last three items the apostle does not speak of the *activity* in which the charisma will manifest itself, but of the *spirit*, the *ethical attitude* of the Christian in which he does certain activities and in which the charisma presents itself.⁴⁸

45 Lietzmann, *An die Römer*, 109: "Statt hinter διάφορα erst den allgemeinen Gedanken zu Ende zu führen ('so lasst sie uns auch dementsprechend benutzen' ...) bringt Pls sofort Beispiele und fällt dabei aus der Konstruktion."

46 See the notes of H. Conzelmann, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (Göttingen, 1969), 248–249, n. 7 and 8.

47 F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R.W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature* (Cambridge, 1961), § 460; see also § 454,3 with a reference to Rom. 2:17; with regard to εἴτε . . . εἴτε cf. § 446: not disjunctive, but practically καί.

48 H. Ridderbos, *Romeinen* (Kampen, 1959), 280, says: "mededelen, nl. van zijn bezit"; though these words might be taken in a spiritual sense, the whole sequence of thought and the Dutch idiom show that it is meant of material possessions. Then Ridderbos continues:

In these last three examples Paul stresses the fact that prophecy, service, teaching, and exhortation are not in themselves a charisma, but that the gift of grace must also show its grace in the relation to others as simplicity, zeal, and cheerfulness.⁴⁹

We have investigated the usage of μεταδιδόναι in the Greek language. It goes without saying that my material is far from complete, but I am convinced that it is fairly representative, and at least much fuller than that of previous commentators of this text in Rom. 12:8.

The result is that only in a few texts of Jewish and Christian origin has the verb to do with giving to the poor; even in these cases this connection is clearly expressed by indicating to whom the gift is made. On the other hand other Jewish and Christian texts employ the word in a quite different setting, so that the linguistic evidence makes it impossible to treat this verb μεταδιδόναι in itself as a *terminus technicus* for “almsgiving”. Up till now I have not come across a single instance in pagan Greek literature where it has this meaning.⁵⁰ In marshalling all data at our disposal for the present moment we see that the verb describes this action: to let another person participate in precious goods one possesses. These “precious goods” may consist in material matters, but in most cases they are immaterial—status, information, education, special knowledge. We often meet the word in a context of religious knowledge which is secret and may be communicated to all man, to some special group, or to nobody.

In the light of this evidence there is no compelling reason why the word μεταδιδούς should be explained here as “almsgiving”. On the contrary a

“Who has received the possibility to do so (viz. to distribute)—*this is also a gift of God!*—shall do it”, etc. (my translation and italics). I wonder how these italicized words can be substantiated by parallels from early Christian literature.

49 It is impossible to discuss here the meaning of προϊστάμενος, which is also explained in different ways, either as “the leader” or “he who gives aid”, see W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*, Sp. 1402, and B. Rigaux, *Saint Paul, les Épîtres*, 576–578. I mention this question here, because there is the trap of a *circulus vitiosus* here, exemplified by M. Dibelius in his explanation of 1 Thess. 5:12: “Charakteristisch ist auch, das Rom. 12:8 die Stellung von προϊστάμενος zwischen μεταδιδούς and ἐλεῶν auf Liebestätigkeit weist” (also Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*, Sp. 1402). And along the same line it may be argued that in Rom. 12:8 μεταδιδούς should be taken as “almsgiving”, because it is followed by προϊστάμενος and ἐλεῶν. But that is sheer prejudice. If μεταδιδούς should be explained differently, as is argued in this paper, the whole argument is worthless.

50 In the careful and thorough investigation of the Greek vocabulary for benevolence made by H. Bolkestein, *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege in vorchristlichen Altertum*, (Utrecht, 1939), the verb μεταδιδόναι is missing. This is the more significant, since the Greeks had many synonyms for this activity.

different interpretation lies more at hand. I know that it is extremely difficult to abandon an exegesis that has been adopted by all modern commentators. But we are forced by Greek usage to do so. If in the future somebody wishes to maintain the—what I think—false explanation, he must present arguments derived from Greek texts and not from a *communis opinio* of commentators.⁵¹ Because the verb is used here without appositions, it is difficult to find an English equivalent that covers all shades of meaning. Since, however, this absolute use stands in a religious context, it in all probability points in the direction of participation in the riches of the Gospel.

We have tried to discover the “atmosphere” that surrounds this verb μεταδιδόναι, to lay bare the associations it has in the Greek language of Paul’s days. On the strength of our findings I would recommend as a translation:

Let he who communicates (the riches of the gospel) show his charisma in simplicity—without self-exaltation, because the riches of the gospel itself is grace.

We cannot evade here some expansion either in the translation or in notes, because the weight carried by μεταδιδόναι and ἀπλότης in the world of Paul’s days is unknown to our contemporaries.

May this exercise in exegesis and translation of one little phrase in the New Testament be a small *antidoron* of this author for Nida’s *metadosis*!

51 This request may seem to force a door open, but is inspired by some bad experience.

Lob und Strafe durch die Obrigkeit. Hellenistisches zu Röm 13,3–4

Der hochverehrte Jubilar hat immer wieder meine Bewunderung erregt durch seine reichen Schriften, die nicht nur Zeugnis ablegen von seinen immensen Kenntnissen in bezug auf die Fachliteratur, sondern vor allem von seinem Scharfsinn und seiner unabhängigen Urteilskraft, die unbeirrt von bestimmten Modeströmungen eigene Wege sucht und findet.

Vor vielen Jahren, als unter von *Dobschütz* und *Windisch* ein Neuanfang mit der Arbeit am „Corpus Hellenisticum“ gemacht wurde, wurde auch Herr *Kümmel* als einer der Mitarbeiter gewonnen. Als damals der Versuch scheiterte, hat er die Arbeit aufgegeben und neue Aufgaben auf anderen Gebieten gefunden. Aber ich bin gewiß, daß er das, was jetzt wieder für den „neuen Wettstein“ geschieht, mit regem Interesse verfolgt. Deshalb sei es wohl gestattet, ihm zu seinem Fest einige Ähren von diesem Felde anzubieten. Der gute Kenner der Geschichte der Exegese weiß, wie sehr die vielen „Spicilegia“ aus früheren Jahrhunderten die Auslegung des Neuen Testaments gefördert haben.

Über die Bedeutung von Röm 13,1–7 braucht man kein Wort zu verlieren, und jeder Leser weiß von den Diskussionen, die auch in den letzten Dezennien darüber geführt worden sind.¹ *Ernst Käsemann* hat sie in seinem schönen Kommentar vorzüglich zusammengefaßt und darauf darf wohl verwiesen werden. Was mich in diesen Verhandlungen immer wieder getroffen hat, ist die geringe Aufmerksamkeit, die dem zeitgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der paulinischen Gedanken geschenkt wird. Nur *August Strobel* hat in zwei Aufsätzen² in dieser Hinsicht sehr wichtiges Material beige-steuert. Er hat jedoch m. E. einen Punkt, der mir von großer Bedeutung scheint, nicht besprochen, und den möchte ich in diesem Beitrag aufgreifen.

In Röm 13,3–4 stellt der Apostel einen Gegensatz auf, der fundamental ist für seine Paränese. V. 2 hat gesagt, daß die Leute, die sich der Obrigkeit widersetzen, „werden sich selbst Verurteilung zuziehen“ (die Übersetzung von *Käsemann*, aaO., 334).

Ist das drohende Futurum eschatologisch oder logisch, d. h. „auf die irdische Bestrafung bezogen?“³ Wäre das erste der Fall, dann hatte der Apostel es

1 *E. Käsemann*, An die Römer (HNT 8a), Tübingen ²1974, 334 f.

2 *A. Strobel*, Zum Verständnis von Rm 13, in: ZNW 47 (1956), 67–93; *ders.*, Furcht, wem Furcht gebührt. Zum profangriechischen Hintergrund von Rm 13,7, in: ZNW 55 (1964), 58–62.

3 *Käsemann*, aaO., 342.

dabei bewenden lassen oder wohl eine Schilderung des göttlichen Strafrichters geben können. Das tut er aber nicht, sondern er gibt eine Begründung: οἱ γὰρ ἄρχοντες. Dazu bemerkt *Käsemann*: „Die pauschale, weder die komplizierten Verhältnisse noch die persönlichen Erfahrungen des Apostels berücksichtigende Sentenz verrät klar die Aufnahme traditioneller Anschauung“,⁴ ohne jedoch Beweise dafür aus antiken Quellen anzugeben. Auch in anderen Kommentaren findet man sie nicht. Ist die Annahme, daß Paulus hier von einer traditionellen Anschauung abhängig ist, eine bloße Vermutung oder kann sie belegt werden? *Strobel* hat mit reichen Quellenangaben gezeigt, daß Paulus hier eine Terminologie verwendet, die in der Umwelt gängig war. Vor allem hat er die Bedeutung von ἔπαινος, die, wie er bemerkt, schon im Altertum der Exegese Mühe bereitet hat, schön beleuchtet.⁵ Den Gegensatz, der in den Versen 3 und 4 enthalten ist, hat er jedoch unbesprochen gelassen.

Paulus sagt: (3) οἱ γὰρ ἄρχοντες οὐκ εἰσὶν φόβος τῷ ἀγαθῷ ἔργῳ ἀλλὰ τῷ κακῷ. θέλεις δὲ μὴ φοβεῖσθαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν; τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποιεῖ, καὶ ἔξεις ἔπαινον ἐξ αὐτῆς· (4) θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονός ἐστιν σοὶ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν. ἐὰν δὲ τὸ κακὸν ποιῇς, φοβοῦ· οὐ γὰρ εἰκῇ τὴν μάχαιραν φορεῖ· θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονός ἐστιν, ἔκδικος εἰς ὀργὴν τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι. Kurz wiedergegeben heißt das also: Von den Behörden wird der, der das Gute tut, gepriesen (und nicht nur, wie man erwarten könnte, unbehelligt gelassen, sondern mit Ehreninschriften⁶ ausgezeichnet), der dagegen etwas Böses tut, wird bestraft.

Wie bekannt, findet sich im 1. Petrusbrief eine Parallele zu dieser Perikope, nämlich 1.Petr 2,13 ff. Vor vielen Jahren habe ich in meinem Aufsatz „A classical Parallel to I Peter ii. 14 and 20“⁷ gezeigt, daß der griechische Autor Diodorus Siculus, der seine Weltgeschichte zwischen 60 und 30 vor Christus schrieb, die Aufgabe des Historikers darin sieht:

τοῖς μὲν ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐπὶ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων τὸν δίκαιον ἐπιλέγειν ἔπαινον, τοὺς δὲ φαύλους, ὅταν ἐξαμαρτάνωσιν, ἀξιοῦν δικαίας ἐπιτιμίας. Lob und Tadel gehören zum festen Bestand der hellenistischen Historiographie.⁸ Da diese Parallele m. M. n. „too striking to be merely accidental“ war und man nicht annehmen kann, daß der Verfasser des Briefes Diodorus gelesen hat, wurde die Vermutung geäußert „that somebody has formulated the duty of state-authorities, as found

4 *Käsemann*, aaO., 342.

5 *Strobel*, Verständnis, 79 ff.

6 Davon gibt *Strobel* viele inschriftliche Belege.

7 *W.C. von Unnik*, A Classical Parallel to I Peter ii. 14 and 20, in: NTS 2 (1955/56), 198–202.

8 *P. Scheller*, De hellenistica historiae conscribendae arte, Diss. Leipzig 1911, 48–50.

in the N.T., and that this maxim was applied by Diodorus or even Ephorus⁹ to the servant of Clio. This missing link I must confess I have not found yet“ (aaO., 201). Seitdem habe ich mehr Material gefunden, das ich hier vorlegen möchte.

a) Lysias, *Oratio* 31,30: ἀναμνήσθητε δὲ δι' ὃ τι ποτε τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἀνδρας γενομένους περὶ τὴν πόλιν τιμάτε καὶ τοὺς κακοὺς ἀτιμάζετε.

b) Xenophon, *Memorabilia Socratis* III 4,8: Socrates macht einen Vergleich zwischen einem Feldherrn und einem Oikonomos. Beide müssen ihre Untergebenen zum Gehorsam bringen, müssen befehlen, und an dritter Stelle καὶ μὴν τὸ τοὺς κακοὺς κολάζειν καὶ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς τιμᾶν ἀμφοτέροις. . . . προσήκειν.

c) Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* I 6,20: die Gesetze lehren vor allem zwei Sachen, nämlich ἀρχειν τε καὶ ἀρχεσθαι; dabei hat er bemerkt; daß die folgende Regel am besten zum Gehorsam antreibt τὸ τὸν πειθόμενον ἐπαινεῖν τε καὶ τιμᾶν, τὸν δὲ ἀπειθοῦντα ἀτιμάζειν τε καὶ κολάζειν.¹⁰

d) Xenophon, *Oeconomicus* 9,14: in den gutgeordneten Städten ist es den Bürgern nicht genug, schöne Gesetze zu schreiben, sondern sie wählen auch νομοφύλακας. . . . οἵτινες ἐπισκοποῦντες τὸν μὲν ποιοῦντα τὰ νόμιμα ἐπαινοῦσιν, ἣν δέ τις παρὰ τοὺς νόμους ποιῇ, ζημιοῦσι.

e) Demosthenes, *Pros Leptinen* 504: alle Gesetze müssen befolgt werden, vor allem die, durch welche die Stadt klein oder groß sein kann. Welche sind das? οἱ τε τοῖς ἀγαθόν τι ποιοῦσι τὰς τιμὰς διδόντες, καὶ οἱ τοῖς τάναντία πράττουσι τὰς τιμωρίας. εἰ γὰρ ἅπαντες ὡς ἀληθῶς τὰς ἐν τοῖς νόμοις ζημίας φοβούμενοι τοῦ κακόν τι ποιεῖν ἀποσταῖν, καὶ πάντες τὰς ἐπὶ ταῖς εὐεργεσίαις δωρεῖας ζηλώσαντες ἃ χρὴ πράττειν προέλοιτο, τί κωλύει¹¹ μεγίστην εἶναι τὴν πόλιν καὶ πάντας χρηστοὺς καὶ μηδὲν εἶναι πονηρόν;

f) Diodorus Siculus, *Hist.Gen.* I 70,6 über die Könige in Ägypten: τὰς μὲν τιμωρίας ἐλάττους τῆς ἀξίας ἐπιτιθεῖς τοῖς ἀμαρτήμασι, τὰς δὲ χάριτας¹² μείζονας

9 Ephorus lebte im 4. Jh. v. Chr.; vgl. H. Gärtner, in: K. Ziegler/W. Sontheimer, Der kleine Pauly. Lexicon der Antike II, Stuttgart 1967, 299–301.

10 Diese Stelle findet sich schon bei G. Raphelius, Annotationes philologicae in Novum Testamentum ex Xenophonte collectae, Hamburg 1720, 214, ist aber nicht in die exegetische Tradition aufgenommen.

11 Vgl. Apg 8,36; ob an dieser Stelle eine Spur „einer alten Taufformel im Neuen Testament“ vorliegt, wie O. Cullmann, Die Tauflehre des Neuen Testaments (ATHANT 12), Zürich 1958, 65 ff. meint, scheint mir fraglich.

12 Χάριτες in der Bedeutung von ‚Gunstbeweise‘ ist sehr bekannt im Griechischen, vgl. H.G. Liddell/R. Scott/H. Stuart Jones, A Greek Lexicon II, Oxford 1940, 1979, Abschnitt III. Hier ist es als Synonym mit ‚Auszeichnung‘ gebraucht, weil nach bekannter griechischer Anschauung eine ‚Wohltat‘ mit einer anderen vergolten werden sollte; vgl. darüber meinen Aufsatz, Die Motivierung der Feindesliebe in Lukas VI 32–35, in: NovTest 8 (1966), 284–300, 291 ff.: das Besondere des ägyptischen Königs ist, daß er mehr gibt.

τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἀποδιδούς τοῖς εὐεργετήσασιν. Er vergeltet also nicht Gleiches mit Gleichem, sondern gibt leichtere Strafen und größere Belohnungen.

g) Diodorus Siculus, *Hist.Gen.* V 71,1 über Zeus, der alle Götter in Tugenden übertraf und der Menschheit Wohltaten erwies, indem er ihnen die Rechtshandeln lehrte: καθόλου δὲ τὰ περὶ τε τῆς εὐνομίας καὶ τῆς εἰρήνης προσαναπληρῶσαι, τοὺς μὲν ἀγαθοὺς πείθοντα, τοὺς δὲ φαύλους τῇ τιμωρίᾳ καὶ τῷ φόβῳ καταπληττόμενον.

h) Diodorus Siculus, *Hist.Gen.* V 71,6: man sagt, daß Zeus μὴ μόνον ἄρδην ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀφανίσει τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς καὶ πονηροὺς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἀρίστοις ... τὰς ἀξίας ἀπονεῖμαι τιμᾶς.

i) Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus* IV, 77: τιωραὶ δ' ἐπ' ἀδίκους ὡς ἐπὶ δίκαιοις τίμαι.¹³

j) Philo, *De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini* § 131: ἡ νομοθετικὴ ... διχὴ πέφυκε τέμνεσθαι, τῇ μὲν εἰς εὐεργεσίαν κατορθούντων, τῇ δὲ εἰς κόλασιν ἀμαρτανόντων (cf. auch § 133: τοῦ μὲν πρὸς εὐεργεσίαν ὁ Λευίτης, τοῦ δὲ πρὸς κόλασιν ὁ ἀκουσίως ἀνελῶν).

k) Philo, *De Vita Mosis* I § 154: Moses wird hoch gepriesen, weil er seine Größe nicht suchte in der äußerlichen Aufmachung, sondern in den Dingen, worin ein Leiter des Volkes sich auszeichnen soll (§ 153: πολυτέλειαν δὲ τῷ ὄντι βασιλικήν, ἐν οἷς καλὸν ἦν πλεονεκτεῖν τὸν ἄρχοντα); dabei zählt Philo eine Anzahl von persönlichen Tugenden auf und am Ende dieser Liste heißt es: προτροπαὶ πρὸς τὰ βέλτιστα, ψόγοι καὶ κολάσεις ἀμαρτανόντων νόμιμοι (also nicht willkürlich!), ἔπαινοι καὶ τιμαὶ κατορθούντων πάλιν σὺν νόμῳ.—Diese Stelle ist sehr bezeichnend, denn für Philo verkörpert Mose das Ideal eines richtigen Archonten.

l) Philo, *De Virtutibus (De Nobilitate)* § 227: keine schlechtere Lehre als diese, „daß weder die von braven Eltern abstammenden und dann schlecht Gewordenen die gerechte Strafe (τιμωρὸς δίκη) trifft noch den Braven, die von schlechteren Eltern abstammen, Ehre (τιμή) zuteil werden soll“, τοῦ νόμου δοκιμάζοντος ἕκαστον αὐτὸν ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ μὴ συγγενῶν ἀρεταῖς ἢ κακίαις ἐπαινοῦντος ἢ κολάζοντος.¹⁴

m) Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum* VI 134: als die letzten Verteidiger Jerusalems sich weigern zu kapitulieren, will Titus persönlich zusammen mit seinen

13 Diese Stelle wurde schon von *Hugo Grotius* in seinen *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum*, Erlangen/Leipzig 1756, und auch von *E.W. Grinfield*, *Scholia Hellenistica in Novum Testamentum* I, London 1848, 386 angegeben, aber nicht in die exegetische Tradition aufgenommen.

14 Was versteht Philo hier unter „das Gesetz“? Im AT denkt man an Ez 18, vgl. Jer 31,29–30; aber dort wird anders formuliert. Philo übernimmt, wie aus dem Vergleich mit dem weiteren Material hervorgeht, die griechische Terminologie.

Soldaten die Stadt stürmen; seine Freunde halten ihn davon zurück; er soll zuschauen. „Denn alle würden unter den Augen des Caesars tapfere Krieger sein. Von diesen Gedanken ließ sich der Caesar gewinnen und erklärte den Soldaten, daß er nur aus dem einen Grunde zurückbleibe, um ihre tapferen Taten zu beurteilen“,¹⁵ ἵνα... μήτε τῶν ἀγαθῶν τις ἀγέραςτος μήτε τῶν ἐναντίων ἀτιμώρητος διαλάβῃ, γένηται δὲ αὐτόπτης καὶ μάρτυς ἀπάντων ὁ καὶ τοῦ κολάζειν καὶ τοῦ τιμᾶν κύριος. – Das Interessante an dieser Stelle ist, daß man hier erstens sieht, wie der Feldherr sich als Herr über Bestrafung und Ehre betrachtet, also dieselbe Auffassung vertritt wie sie z. B. bei Xenophon gefunden wird (s. o. 336) und dann, wie diese Regel *in actu* gestellt wird.¹⁶

n) Josephus, *Antiquitates Iudaicae* VI 267: in einer Reflexion über Leute, die aus niedrigen Umständen zur königlichen Macht gekommen sind und als Tyrannen auftreten: τιμῶσι μὲν τοὺς πολλὰ τάλαιπωρήσαντας, τιμήσαντες δὲ φθονοῦσι, καὶ παραγαγόντες εἰς ἐπιφάνειαν οὐ ταύτης ἀφαιροῦνται μόνον τοὺς τετυχηκότας, ἀλλὰ διὰ ταύτην καὶ τοῦ ζῆν ἐπὶ πονηραῖς αἰτίαις... κολάζουσι δ' οὐκ ἐπ' ἔργοις δικῆς ἀξίοις, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ διαβολαῖς καὶ κατηγορίαις ἄβυσανίστοις.—An dieser Stelle sieht man, wie die Regel dem Josephus bekannt ist, aber wie sie von einem schlechten Herrscher vergewaltigt wird.

o) Dio Chrysostomos, *Orationes* 39,2: die Götter als Stadtgründer und Vorfahren wünschen für ihre Nachkommen mehr als materielle Vorteile, nämlich u. a. πολιτεῖαν νόμιμον καὶ τῶν μὲν ἀγαθῶν πολιτῶν τιμὴν, τῶν δὲ κακῶν ἀτιμίαν. Auf diese Parallele hat *Mussies* schon hingewiesen.¹⁷ Die anderen von ihm erwähnten Stellen sind nicht so bezeichnend, weil sie den gesuchten Gegensatz nicht enthalten.

p) Aristides, *Apologia* 13,7: in einer Polemik gegen den Polytheismus wird gesagt, daß die griechische Mythologie erzählt, wie die Götter die Gesetze durch Ehebruch, Diebstahl usw. übertreten; deshalb sind entweder die Gesetze gut, die Götter aber schlecht, oder die Götter gut, aber die Gesetze schlecht; bei diesem Dilemma sagt der christliche Apologet νῦν δὲ οἱ νόμοι καλοὶ εἰσὶ καὶ δίκαιοι, τὰ καλὰ ἐπαινοῦντες καὶ τὰ κακὰ ἀπαγαρεύοντες. Deshalb sind die heidnischen

15 Die Übersetzung von O. Michel/O. Bauernfeind, Flavius Josephus. De Bello Judaico. Der Jüdische Krieg Bd. II/2, Darmstadt 1969, 23.

16 Michel/Bauernfeind, aaO., 166 A. 48 bemerken dann: „Die Schilderung der Beobachterrolle des Titus... wirkt propagandistisch, läßt aber die Frage offen, ob sie der eigentlichen Haltung eines römischen Feldherrn in dieser Situation gerecht wird.“ Die Frage ist nicht richtig gestellt, denn sie rechnet nicht damit, daß Josephus sich einer bekannten Auffassung, wie sie aus unserem Material hervorgeht, anschließt.

17 G. Mussies, Dio Chrysostom and the New Testament. Parallels Collected (Studia ad Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti 2), Leiden 1972, 151 hat diese Stelle schon angegeben.

Götter verurteilt. Bemerkenswert ist hier, daß für Aristides die Gesetze sowieso gut und der Kritik enthoben sind.¹⁸

q) Athenagoras, *Supplicatio* 24: in einer Zwischenbemerkung wird zur Unterstützung der Auffassung des menschlichen freien Willens in Sachen von Sünde und Tugend, gesagt: ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν οὕτ' ἐτιμάτε τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς καὶ ἐκολάζετε τοὺς πονηροὺς, εἰ μὴ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἦν καὶ ἡ κακία καὶ ἡ ἀρετή. Der Apologet richtet sich hier direkt an die Kaiser. Deshalb ist diese Zwischenbemerkung so wichtig, weil Athenagoras sich hier auf die von den Kaisern befolgte Praxis beruft; aus der allgemeinen Regel folgert er, daß deshalb Sünde und Tugend im Bereich der freien menschlichen Wahl liegen.¹⁹

r) Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* VI 6,16 und 18 in einer Besprechung und Widerlegung des Glaubens an die Heimarmene. Wenn jemand daran glaubt, sagt er: keine Anstrengung ist nötig, denn es wird doch geschehen, was bestimmt ist. Und Eusebius bemerkt anschließend: ὁ δὲ περὶ τι σπουδάζων ἢ διδάσκων ἢ προτρέπων ἢ ἑαυτὸν ἢ ἄλλον καὶ τὸ πείθεσθαι καὶ τὸ μὴ πείθεσθαι καὶ τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν καὶ τό τε ἐπιτιμᾶν τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσι, καὶ τὸ ἐπαινεῖν τοὺς κατορθοῦτας, πῶς οὐκ ἐναργῶς ἐλέγχεται τὸ μὲν ἔργον καταλιπὼν τοῦ παρ' ἡμῖν καὶ τοῦ αὐτεξουσίου, τὸ δὲ τῆς εἰμαρμένης ὄνομα αὐτῷ συνάπτων μόνον;.... 18 (Die Gesetze sind gemacht zum Nutzen der Menschen). τί γὰρ χρὴ προστάττειν ἢ ἀπαγορεύειν τοῖς ὑφ' ἑτέρας ἀνάγκης κατισχυμένοις, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας δεήσει κολάζειν μὴ παρὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν ἡμαρτηκότας, οὐδὲ τοῖς τὰ κάλλιστα πράττουσι τιμὰς ἀπονέμειν, ὧν ἑκάτερον πολλὴν αἰτίαν παρέσχηκεν εἰς ἀναστολὴν ἀδικίας καὶ εἰς εὐποίας ἐτοιμότητα. Aus der Argumentation des Euseb geht klar hervor, daß er annimmt, diese Regel sei allgemein anerkannt; aber durch die Gültigkeit wird der Glauben an die Heimarmene ausgeschlossen, denn Lob und Tadel oder Strafe sind nur am Platze, wenn die Menschen in freier Entscheidung Gutes oder Böses tun.

s) Ps. Lysias, *Oratio* 2, *Epitaphios* in der Beschreibung einer guten Demokratie (17–19): νόμῳ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς τιμώντες καὶ τοὺς κακοὺς κολάζοντες.

t) Tatianus, *Oratio ad Graecos* 7,1–2 über den freien Willen: ὅπως ὁ μὲν φαῦλος δικαίως κολάζεται δι' αὐτὸν γεγονὼς μοχθηρός, ὁ δὲ δίκαιος χάριν τῶν ἀνδραγαθημάτων ἀξίως ἐπαινῆται, weil er nach freiem Entschluß den Willen Gottes nicht übertreten hat.

18 Die Worte über die Gesetze stehen nicht in der syrischen Übersetzung, die dadurch die eigentliche Pointe der Beweisführung weggelassen hat.—In den Kommentaren zu Aristides werden keine Parallelen notiert.

19 Weder J. Geffcken, *Zwei griechische Apologeten*, Leipzig/Berlin 1907, noch andere Übersetzer von Athenagoras bieten dazu Kommentar.

Hiermit habe ich das Material zusammengestellt, soweit ich es bis jetzt gesammelt habe. Ich bin mir klar bewußt, daß viel mehr in der antiken Literatur zu finden ist, denn das hat die Erfahrung bei anderen Untersuchungen für das Corpus Hellenisticum wohl gezeigt. Die vorgelegten Stellen sind jedoch zahlreich genug, um einige Schlüsse in Beziehung auf Röm 13 zu erlauben.

Vorher soll jedoch noch eine andere Frage beantwortet werden. In unserer Sammlung stehen 4 Stellen aus christlichen Autoren und dabei erhebt sich die Frage, ob es erlaubt ist, diese als unabhängige Zeugnisse anzuführen oder ob sie irgendwie von Paulus, bzw. durch die christliche Tradition beeinflusst sind und deshalb nicht in diese Reihe gehören. Die Antwort kann u. E. deutlich sein und ist implizit schon damit gegeben, daß sie aufgenommen wurden und nicht in eine Fußnote gestellt wurden. Zur näheren Begründung dieser Entscheidung darf darauf hingewiesen werden, daß die Verfasser sich erstens nicht mit einem Zitat auf Paulus (oder den 1. Petrusbrief) berufen und daß zweitens die Terminologie und Formulierung so verschieden sind, daß nichts in die Richtung einer Entlehnung weist (die Herausgeber dieser Schriften geben auch keinen Verweis auf das NT). Weit wichtiger jedoch ist die Tatsache, daß die Regel bei den altchristlichen Autoren in Apologien steht und daß sie nur als Argument gebraucht wird, um etwas anderes zu beweisen. Hier war „common ground“ mit den heidnischen Lesern, die einer solchen Aussage auch zustimmten; weil man diese Auffassung auf beiden Seiten teilte, konnten die christlichen Apologeten den Versuch unternehmen, weiter zu kommen, und zwar mit einer Widerlegung des Polytheismus oder in ihrem Kampf für die menschliche Freiheit in sittlichen Entscheidungen.

In der obigen Liste sind also Zeugnisse aus der Zeit vom 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis zum 4. Jahrhundert n. Chr. zusammengestellt. Es ist klar, daß die verwendeten Worte oft nicht die gleichen sind, daß aber derselbe Gedanke immer wiederkehrt, nämlich daß es zum Wesen der Obrigkeit gehört, die Bösewichter oder Schlechten zu strafen und die Guten zu preisen. Der Name, mit dem die „Obrigkeit“ angedeutet wird, mag wechseln (Archontes; Gesetze; Kaiser; Feldherr), die Aufgabe, die sie zu erledigen hat und der sie sich bewußt sein soll, ist immer die gleiche. Es ist bezeichnend, wie Titus nach dem Bericht des Josephus (s. o. 338) diesem Selbstgefühl mit dem Worte κύριος Ausdruck gibt. Es ist auch charakteristisch, wie Philo dieses Motiv im Bild des mustergültigen Führers Mose als letzten Punkt erwähnt.

In der Aussage des Lysias (s. o. 336) ist der Gebrauch von ποτε auffällig. In seiner Zeit scheint es also noch nicht allgemein anerkannt und Regel zu sein. Er argumentiert mit einer Tatsache, die wohl vorkommt, aber deutlich noch nicht eingebürgert ist. Bei Xenophon spürt man eine bestimmte Veränderung;

bei ihm steht es schon fest, daß die Handhaber der Gesetze dazu bestellt sind, so zu handeln.

In der hellenistischen und römischen Zeit, die sich auch in den Schriften Philos so gut spiegelt, ist diese Aufgabe der Obrigkeit weithin bekannt.²⁰

Diese Aufgabe konnte je nach den Umständen antithetisch oder komplementär formuliert werden. Obwohl die Antithese bei den Griechen sehr beliebt war,²¹ ist sie nicht die ausschließliche Form, die hier gebraucht wird.

Es ist aus diesen Zeugnissen nicht nur deutlich, daß die Erteilung von Lob und Strafe als Aufgabe der guten Obrigkeit angesehen wurde, sondern auch weshalb sie diese Aufgabe zu erfüllen hatte. Das Ziel ist, die Bürger dadurch vom Bösen abzuhalten und zum Guten anzuleiten; die Regel hat einen ethischen Zweck.

Wenn wir im Lichte dieses hellenistischen Materials den Passus in Röm 13,3–4 wieder lesen, ist es klar, daß der Apostel mit dieser Regel bekannt ist und auch Bekanntschaft mit ihr voraussetzt, denn er argumentiert von dort aus.²² Er wollte darauf hinweisen, weshalb die Leute, die sich der Obrigkeit widersetzen, ein *χρῖμα* erwarten konnten. An sich wäre es für seine Argumentation nicht nötig, dabei zu erwähnen, daß die Obrigkeit auch Lob spendet für die Leute, die das Gute tun; und deshalb hat dieser Satz immer den Exegeten einige Schwierigkeiten bereitet. Er wirkt hier als ein Einschub, aber von der allgemeinen Regel her wird diese Hinzufügung ganz verständlich. Der Apostel hat die Regel nicht einfach als solche übernommen, sondern sie wird,—wie wir das auch bei anderen, die sie verwenden, sehen—mit eigenen Worten formuliert und in eigener Weise bearbeitet.

Diese Bearbeitung zeigt sich deutlich, wenn wir diese Paulus-Stelle mit 1.Petr 2,14 vergleichen. Im 1. Petrusbrief ist der Gedanke sehr schlicht, als Maxime formuliert: *εἰς ἐκδίχσιν κακοποιῶν ἔπαινον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν*. Paulus dagegen gibt eine ausführliche Umschreibung mit einer rhetorischen Frage („im Sinne eines abgekürzten Bedingungssatzes“)²³ und vor allem macht er Gebrauch von der direkten Anrede in der zweiten Person des Singulars. Die Häufung dieser Anrede

20 H. Almqvist, Plutarch und das Neue Testament (ASNU 15), Uppsala 1946, gibt keine Parallele aus Plutarch; aber ich möchte nicht ausschließen, daß bei diesem Autor noch einiges zu finden ist, da Almqvists Sammlung nicht vollständig ist.

21 B.A. van Groningen, De antithese als Griekse denkvorm, in: Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Akademie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België (Klasse der Letteren XV), 1953, Nr. 1.

22 Es ist merkwürdig, daß J.J. Wettstein in seinem *Novum Testamentum* keine Parallelen angegeben hat.

23 O. Michel, Der Brief an die Römer (MeyerK IV), Göttingen ¹²1963, 318.

ist sehr bezeichnend: θέλεις—ποίει—ἔξεις—σοι—ποιῆς—φοβοῦ). Darin ver-
rät sich der Stil der Diatribe, die, wie *Bultmann* in seiner Jugendschrift über-
zeugend nachgewiesen hat,²⁴ Paulus des öfteren, namentlich im Römerbrief,
verwendet. Nun hat *Bultmann* zu unserer Stelle bemerkt, daß „vielleicht“ hier
„die ganz gewöhnliche Neigung maßgebend (ist), allgemeine Vorschriften in
der 2. pers. sing. zu geben“.²⁵ Diese Bemerkung scheint mir nicht richtig. Der
Gebrauch der rhetorischen Frage, die Häufung der 2. Person, die Ausweitung
des Gedankens weisen alle in die Richtung einer Diskussion mit einem fin-
gierten Interlokutor, wie sie in der Diatribe so gewöhnlich ist. Dadurch wird in
lebendiger Weise der Hauptgedanke dem Leser vorgeführt.

Wenn wir also feststellen, daß Paulus hier eine allen bekannte Regel bearbei-
tet, ist das Resultat in verschiedener Hinsicht von Bedeutung. Erstens braucht
man nicht mehr zu vermuten, daß der Apostel eine traditionelle Anschauung
aufnimmt (s. o. 335), sondern man sieht deutlich, von woher er sie bekommen
hat und daß er wohl bekannt war mit dieser hellenistischen Auffassung der
Obrigkeit. Zweitens zeigt sich, daß in dieser Sache der 1. Petrusbrief nicht von
Paulus abhängig ist, wie oft angenommen wird, sondern daß beide Autoren
dieselbe Anschauung gebrauchten, die schon längst vor der Entstehung des
Christentums bekannt war. Beide Schriftsteller nebeneinander legen davon
Zeugnis ab, daß diese Formulierung der Aufgabe der Obrigkeit von Christen
übernommen ist. Und drittens sehen wir desto schärfer das Besondere des
Paulus: in der hellenistischen Anschauung ist die Obrigkeit autonom, sie erteilt
Lob und Strafe aus eigener Gesetzlichkeit, und das wird nicht weiter begründet
als im Wohlergehen der Gemeinschaft; bei Paulus ist die Obrigkeit von Gott
eingesetzt und auch abhängig, Gottes Instrument (θεοῦ διάκονος), womit er
Ursprung und Begrenzung der Macht angibt; eine *gute* Obrigkeit soll nach die-
ser Regel handeln (bei Josephus [s. o. 338 f.] sehen wir, wie das auch fehlgehen
kann, und Philo [s. o. 337 f.] weist nicht umsonst auf die Übereinstimmung mit
dem Gesetz hin).

Mit diesem Beitrag hoffe ich gezeigt zu haben, welchen Gewinn die mühse-
lige Arbeit am Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti bringen kann, aber vor
allem dem verehrten Jubilar einige Freude durch dieses Zeichen des Dankes
bereitet zu haben.

24 *R. Bultmann*, Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe
(FRLANT 13), Göttingen 1910, 13 f. 66 f.

25 *Bultmann*, aaO., 66 A. 1.

Flavius Josephus



Flavius Josephus als historischer Schriftsteller

I Josephus, der Vernachlässigte

Wo stehen wir heute in und mit der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft?

Diese Frage ist ungefähr fünfundzwanzig Jahre nach dem Neuanfang am Ende des 2. Weltkriegs wohl nicht unzeitgemäß. Vor zwei Jahren veröffentlichte der amerikanische Alttestamentler Childs sein Buch über die Krise der Biblischen Theologie, die etwa zwei Dezennien im Zentrum der ökumenischen Theologie stand, aber jetzt durch etwas anderes ersetzt wird.¹ Was dort über die Biblische Theologie im allgemeinen gesagt wird, trifft auch das neutestamentliche Studium ins Herz. Wir brauchen indes nicht nach Yale zu reisen, um das zu hören. In diesem Jahre veröffentlichte Stuhlmacher seine „Thesen zur Methodologie gegenwärtiger Exegese“, die er im September 1971 auf einem Neutestamentlertreffen vorgetragen hat; er sprach „von einem Niedergang der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft in Deutschland“, von „unserer gegenwärtigen exegetischen Misere“.² Welche Reaktion dieser Vortrag ausgelöst hat, ist mir unbekannt; mich hat aber diese Zeichnung der Lage durch einen jüngeren Fachgenossen sehr beeindruckt.

Es ist nicht meine Absicht, hier einen historischen Überblick zu geben und die Geschichte unserer Disziplin im letzten Vierteljahrhundert zu skizzieren. Auch möchte ich nicht die Richtigkeit dieser Beschreibung der Sachlage diskutieren oder fragen, wie die Situation sich von einer Hochblüte zur Misere verändert hat. Nur zwei Bemerkungen seien mir gestattet. Erstens darf doch wohl die Frage gestellt werden, ob man nicht seine Erwartungen zu hoch gespannt und die neutestamentliche Exegese mit gewisser Einseitigkeit betrieben hat unter Vernachlässigung bestimmter Teile dieses Fachs und anderer theologischer Disziplinen. Zweitens: Eine christliche Theologie, die ihre Identität nicht verlieren will, kann und darf niemals die zentrale Stellung des Neuen Testaments aufgeben, und das heißt, daß die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft weitergehen muß, unentwegt, mit dem *Novum Testamentum Graece* in der Hand—wohl in dieser Zeit, aber nicht den Moden dieser Zeit unterworfen.

Nun kann man mit Stuhlmacher feststellen und bedauern, „daß nicht nur das studentische und teilweise auch das kirchliche Interesse an der Exegese vor allem des Neuen Testaments abnimmt und z. T. bereits sogar in eine Art

1 B.S. Childs, *Biblical Theology in Crisis*, Philadelphia 1970.

2 P. Stuhlmacher, *Thesen zur Methodologie gegenwärtiger Exegese*, in: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* LXIII (1972), S. 19.

von Argwohn umgeschlagen, sondern daß gleichzeitig auch eine Einigung oder wenigstens Gemeinsamkeit der Exegeten in gewichtigsten Fragen unseres Faches immer mehr abhanden gekommen ist“,³ und versuchen, durch Methodenkritik die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft zur Selbstkorrektur zu bringen. Hoffentlich wird das Erfolg haben. Aber es besteht immer die Gefahr—and als Ausländer darf ich wohl sagen: vor allem in Deutschland—, daß man sich in Debatten über die Methode verliert und in den Prolegomena steckenbleibt. Es sollte doch stets bedacht werden, daß die Methode ein Hilfsmittel ist und daß sie nicht mehr, aber auch nicht weniger Bedeutung hat als ein Instrument. Sie steht im Dienste des Forschers, um das Material seines Studiums besser kennenzulernen.

Wenn wir jetzt über die Situation der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft sprechen, dürfen wir nicht vergessen, daß in den letzten fünfundzwanzig Jahren innerhalb dieses Forschungsbereichs einige Entdeckungen gemacht worden sind, die das Material sehr erweitert haben und von solcher Bedeutung sind, daß dadurch die Sachlage sich vollständig geändert hat. Diese Änderungen sind unabhängig von bestimmten geistigen Gegenwartsströmungen, und ihr Einfluß ist bleibend.

Natürlich denke ich dabei vor allem an die Entdeckungen von Qumran und von Nag Hammadi. Die Zeit der Sensation ist vorüber. Das Entdeckte ist in den festen Bestand der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft aufgenommen; aber das kann nicht heißen, daß es jetzt schon seine Wirkung getan hat. Im Gegenteil m.E. steckt die Neuorientierung am Leitfaden dieser Entdeckungen in der neutestamentlichen Forschung noch in ihren Anfängen.

Die gnostischen Schriften sind teilweise veröffentlicht, und es besteht gute Hoffnung, daß in absehbarer Zeit die ganze Bibliothek zugänglich sein wird.⁴ Damit wird nicht nur eine Unmenge von neuen Fragen den Gnosis-Forschern vorgelegt, sondern auch die alte Frage „Gnosis und Neues Testament“ neu aufgerollt. Bei aller tiefen Bewunderung und in großem Respekt vor den Studien von Bousset und Reitzenstein muß gesagt werden, daß ihre Arbeit und die ihrer Nachfolger veraltet ist, da sie gezwungen waren, mit unvollständigem Material zu arbeiten. Das heißt auch, daß die Konstruktionen und Hypothesen, die Bultmann und seine Schüler aufgebaut haben, nicht mehr aufrechtzuerhalten sind. Das hat natürlich bis tief in die neutestamentliche Exegese und Theologie hinein seine Konsequenzen.

3 P. Stuhlmacher, *a.a.O.*, S. 18.

4 J.M. Robinson, *The Coptic Gnostic Library today*, in: *New Testament Studies* XIV (1968), pp. 356–401.

Es erübrigt sich, ausführlich über die Funde von Qumran zu sprechen. Ihre Bedeutung für die Interpretation des Neuen Testaments ist schon reichlich ans Licht gestellt. Hier soll nur auch betont werden, daß noch viel Material der Herausgabe harrt und daß wir deshalb nicht wissen, was an neuen Fragen und an neuem Licht noch zu erwarten ist. Aber dabei soll auch unterstrichen werden, daß diese Schriften nicht nur an sich unsere Kenntnisse über Erwarten erweitert, sondern daß sie auch wie eine Lawine gewirkt haben und noch wirken. Am Beispiel der Targumin kann man sich klar machen, wie sehr die Rollen vom Toten Meer bei schon längst bekanntem Material die Diskussion befruchtet haben. In meiner Studentenzeit wußte man vielleicht, daß es so etwas wie späte aramäische Paraphrasen des Alten Testaments gab. Aber wer zog sie in Betracht oder versuchte, sie zu verwerten? Jetzt hat sich die Lage stark geändert, und die Targumin werden als wichtige Zeugen der exegetischen Tradition des Judentums geschätzt. *Mutatis mutandis* könnte man so auch von den Anregungen sprechen, die Qumran auf das Studium der Apokryphen und der Pseudepigraphen oder auf die Septuaginta-Forschung ausgeübt hat und noch weiter ausüben wird.

Weil wir das Neue Testament nicht „docketisch“ betrachten, sondern seine Botschaft sprachlich und historisch in seinem Kontext lesen, um imstande zu sein, sie wirklich zu verstehen und für die Gegenwart auszulegen, sind diese Entdeckungen, die uns diesen Kontext besser kennen lehren, von höchster Wichtigkeit und zwingen zur Revision alter Positionen. Es handelt sich hier eben nicht nur um eine einfache Addition neuer Daten, die sich einfach in die alten Schemata einfügen lassen, sondern um ein genaueres Verständnis, weil wir nun die Umwelt des Neuen Testaments besser überschauen. Dabei haben wir nur die am wenigsten erwarteten und größten Entdeckungen ins Auge gefaßt und nicht einmal erwähnt, was z. B. durch die Archäologie zutage gefördert ist. Auch geht die schon früher angefangene Arbeit am rabbinischen Schrifttum weiter, und selbst da hat man oft den Eindruck, daß wir noch in den Anfängen stecken.

Wir Menschen, vor allem in dieser Zeit, die wir erstaunliche Entdeckungen in den Naturwissenschaften und Umwälzungen in den sozialen Verhältnissen miterlebt haben, sind geneigt, von allem, was „neu“ ist oder heißt, fasziniert zu sein. Wir dürfen jedoch in unserer neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft nicht vergessen, daß es auch viele Quellen gibt, die schon längst bekannt sind, jedenfalls dem Namen nach, aber noch bei weitem nicht vollständig ausgenutzt sind. So habe ich bei meiner Arbeit am *CORPUS HELLENISTICUM NOVI TESTAMENTI* die Erfahrung gemacht, daß bei den klassischen Autoren, die schon seit der Renaissance-Zeit veröffentlicht sind, noch viel zu finden ist, was für die Interpretation des Neuen Testaments fruchtbar gemacht werden kann.

Das geht allerdings nicht immer gewissermaßen in direkter Weise vor sich, so daß man unmittelbar eine „erklärende Parallele“ in die Hand bekommt, sondern oft indirekt, wenn nämlich ganze Lebens- oder Gedankenkomplexe zum Vorschein kommen, auf deren Hintergrund neutestamentliche Aussagen schärfer hervortreten.

Die Weisheit in dem Vers: „Wer den Dichter will verstehen, muß in Dichters Lande gehen“ ist nicht veraltet; sie gilt vielleicht für unser Studium des Neuen Testaments heute mehr als zuvor. Wenn wir auf die Sprache der Apostel hören wollen, heißt das, daß wir *ihre* Sprache und nicht ein fremdes Deutsch, Holländisch oder Englisch hören müssen, und diese Sprache lernt man nur durch das Lesen von antiken zeitgenössischen Quellen. In dieser Zeit, in der auch in West-Europa die Kenntnisse der klassischen Sprachen immer mehr abnehmen und fast zum Verschwinden verdammt sind, ist es für die Bibelwissenschaft sicher notwendig, sich immer wieder darüber klar zu werden, daß richtige Exegese nur möglich ist, wenn man unermüdlich den Weg *AD FONTES* sucht und geht und die alte Wahrheit, die von den Reformatoren und Humanisten entdeckt wurde, nicht verliert, sondern sie sich immer zueigen macht: „So lieb nu alls uns das Euangelion ist, so hart last uns uber den Sprachen hallten . . . Ja wo wyr versehen, das wyr (da Gott fur sey) die sprachen faren lassen, so werden wir . . . das Euangelion verlieren . . .“⁵ Dieser Weg ist oft lang, mühsam und schwierig, aber auch freudenvoll und lohnend. Auch für uns gilt das Wort aus dem Matthäusevangelium: „Darum ist jeder Schriftgelehrte, der ein Jünger für die Himmelsherrschaft wurde, einem Hausherrn gleich, der aus seinem Schatz Neues und Altes hervorholt“ (Matth. 13:52; Übersetzung von J. Schniewind). Alte Quellen, die noch nicht ausgeschöpft sind, und neue, die erst in dieser Zeit entdeckt wurden, sind in reichem Maße da und sollten nutzbar gemacht werden. Deshalb ist es, trotz dessen, was ich soeben über unsere Zeit gesagt habe, für den Neutestamentler eine hoffnungsreiche Zeit, in der man mit Freude arbeiten kann.

Wo stehen wir also mit der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft? Meine Antwort ist: vor einem Neuanfang; denn viele neue Fragen werden erst jetzt am sich ausdehnenden Material entdeckt, und dadurch muß, was schon gefunden wurde, wieder neu taxiert werden.

Ich möchte das Wort „Neuanfang“ unterstreichen; denn es ist ein genauer Ausdruck meiner Ansicht. Nach etwa 45 Jahren der Arbeit auf diesem Gebiet, bin ich nicht in der Stimmung des Predigers: „Es gibt nichts Neues unter der Sonne“ oder des Psalmisten: „Das Meiste daran ist Mühsal und Beschwer“.

5 M. Luther, *An die Ratsherrn aller Städte deutsches Lands*, in: Luthers Werke in Auswahl, ed. O. Clemen, Bd. 11, Berlin 1929, S. 451.

Der Dienst am Worte ist auch in dieser Zeit, auch in diesem Fachgebiet, voll von Verheißung und reich an Hoffnung. Möchte sich etwas von der Freude, die in „Gabe und Aufgabe“ geschenkt ist, auch in diesen Vorlesungen zeigen und andere, Jüngere, zur Mitarbeit inspirieren!

Dies alles möchte ich gern einmal öffentlich aussprechen, nicht weil es unbekannt ist, sondern weil es in den Verwirrungen dieser Zeit notwendig ist, bestimmte Tatsachen nicht aus dem Auge zu verlieren und sich nicht in die Irre leiten zu lassen. Aber jetzt Schluß mit Allgemeinheiten! „Willst du dich am Ganzen erquicken, so mußt du das Ganze im Kleinsten erblicken“, schrieb Goethe einmal, und das gilt auch für unsere wissenschaftliche Arbeit. Das Thema unserer Vorlesungen versucht „das Ganze“ des vorher Gesagten an einem bestimmten Beispiel zu exemplifizieren, obwohl es bestimmt nicht „das Kleinste“ ist.

Wie verknüpfen sich in diesem Fall Ende und Neuanfang? Es scheint mir hier in Münster eigentlich ganz einfach, und damit ist auch das Thema gegeben, mit dem das vorher Gesagte über die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft exemplifiziert werden kann.

Sie alle wissen, wie hier im Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum in den vergangenen Jahren intensiv daran gearbeitet worden ist, eine mit einem Lexikon verbundene Konkordanz zu Flavius Josephus zu schaffen. Nachdem Abraham Schalit bereits vor einiger Zeit das Namenregister in der Form eines Namenwörterbuchs als ein vorzügliches Arbeitsinstrument herausgebracht hat,⁶ steht jetzt der erste Band der Konkordanz unmittelbar vor dem Erscheinen.⁷ Daneben hat uns einer der Mitarbeiter, Heinz Schreckenberg, mit zwei wertvollen Büchern beschenkt.⁸ Aber das alles ist erst eine ἀπαρχή von dem, was noch kommen und einen neuen Aufschwung des Josephus-Studiums ermöglichen wird. Die Anzeichen dafür sind auch anderswo wahrnehmbar, so im Institutum Judaicum in Tübingen, beim Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum in Halle oder in einem Beitrag des amerikanischen Forschers L.H. Feldman.⁹ So werden nun die Grundlagen gelegt, die es ermöglichen

6 K.H. Rengstorf (ed.), *A complete Concordance to FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, Supplement I: Namenwörterbuch zu Flavius Josephus* von A. Schalit, Leiden 1968.

7 [Inzwischen erschienen: K.H. Rengstorf (ed.), *A complete Concordance to FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, Vol. I: A–Δ*, Leiden 1973. Vol. II: E–K, Leiden 1975].

8 H. Schreckenberg, *Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus* (Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums I), Leiden 1968.—H. Schreckenberg, *Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter* (ALGHJ V), Leiden 1972.

9 L.H. Feldman, *Hellenizations in Josephus' Portrayal of Man's Decline*, in: J. NEUSNER (ed.), *Religions in Antiquity, Essays in Memory of ERWIN RAMDSELL GOODENOUGH*, Leiden 1968, pp. 336–353.

sollen, diesen bedeutenden Schriftsteller und Zeitgenossen der ersten christlichen Generation wirklich zu studieren und auszuwerten.

Josephus ist, seit er seine Schriften veröffentlichte, niemals wie so mancher Autor des Altertums der Vergessenheit anheimgefallen. Die *Testimonia Veterum*, die Heinz Schreckenberg mit großer Umsicht so vollständig gesammelt hat, und die vielen Handschriften und Übersetzungen aus Altertum und Mittelalter, die in seinem Buch angegeben sind, geben davon ein beredtes Zeugnis. Bereits Eusebius hat Josephus in seiner „Kirchengeschichte“ rühmlich erwähnt (*H.E.* III 9,2); er nennt ihn den berühmtesten Mann unter seinen Landsleuten auch bei den Römern, der durch eine Statue in Rom geehrt wurde und dessen Werke der Aufnahme in die (öffentliche) Bibliothek für würdig erachtet wurden. Durch Hieronymus (*De Viris Illustribus* 13) wurde dies Ruhmeszeugnis wiederholt und weit verbreitet.¹⁰ Vor einigen Jahren hätten wir feiern können, daß schon im Jahre 1470 die lateinische Übersetzung seiner Werke zum erstenmal zum Druck befördert und damit in die Reihe der ersten gedruckten Texte aufgenommen wurde. Der griechische Text folgte nach einem Dreivierteljahrhundert in dem berühmten Verlag des Frobenius in Basel (1544), und seitdem ist er immer wieder gelesen und benutzt worden.

Mir wurde einmal erzählt, daß es im Wohnzimmer vornehmer Häuser in den Niederlanden im 18. Jahrhundert immer zwei Pulte gab: auf dem einen lag die „Statenvertaling“, die offizielle holländische Bibelübersetzung, auf dem andern eine Josephus-Ausgabe. Vielleicht wäre es etwas übertrieben, wollte man annehmen, daß es überall so war; immerhin ist, was wir da hören, bezeichnend für die hohe Wertschätzung, die dem jüdischen Geschichtsschreiber entgegengebracht wurde. Aber vor etwa hundert Jahren stellte der berühmte holländische Theologe J.J. van Oosterzee fest, daß zu seiner Zeit eine andere Lage eingetreten war:¹¹ das Buch *par excellence* zur Auslegung der Bibel waren die Werke des Josephus nun nicht mehr. Natürlich bedeutet das nicht, daß er vergessen wurde. Was wären Emil Schürer und andere Verfasser Neutestamentlicher Zeitgeschichten ohne Josephus? Seine Schriften sind und bleiben anerkanntermaßen eine Quelle ersten Ranges für die Geschichte Palästinas in der Zeit zwischen etwa 200 v. Chr. und 100 n. Chr. Man kann nur wünschen, daß auch für andere Teile des römischen Reiches wie Syrien und Kleinasien solche Schatzhäuser mit historischem Material zur Verfügung ständen!

10 H. Schreckenberg, *Flavius-Josephus-Tradition*, S. 94.

11 J.J. van Oosterzee. *Aanbevelend woord*, in: *Al de werken van Flavius Josephus*, bewerkt door W.A. Terwagt 3, Dordrecht 1868 (die Seiten dieser Einleitung sind nicht nummeriert).

Josephus ist und wird immer wieder benutzt und zitiert; wer kann zahlenmäßig ausdrücken, wie oft das geschehen ist?! Und doch läßt sich fragen, ob der vielzitierte Historiker auch wirklich gekannt wird. Ist er nicht viel mehr Lieferant von Daten als verantwortungsvoller Autor? Hat man seine Schriften wirklich gelesen, exegisiert und in richtiger Weise ausgeschöpft?

Wir sind Heinz Schreckenberg zu großem Dank verpflichtet, daß er uns eine vorzügliche Bibliographie der Josephus-Forschung in die Hand gegeben hat. Aber gibt dies Buch von rund 300 Seiten über die Arbeit in fünf Jahrhunderten nicht zu denken, wenn wir daneben die erstaunliche Produktivität sehen, die die Funde von Qumran in fünfundzwanzig Jahren hervorgerufen haben? Ist das, was hinsichtlich Josephus geleistet wurde, demgegenüber eigentlich nicht sehr wenig?

Hat Josephus es uns vielleicht zu einfach gemacht? Natürlich ruft die handschriftliche Überlieferung seiner Werke nicht so viele Probleme hervor wie die Fetzen und abgerissenen Rollen, die aus den Höhlen am Toten Meer ans Licht kamen. Die Entzifferung und Erschließung der Qumran-Texte war eine große Herausforderung und wird es vorläufig wohl auch bleiben. Für Josephus scheint die Lage ganz anders zu sein. Hat man da nicht die mustergültige Ausgabe von Benedikt Niese? Gilt da nicht: Niesius edidit, causa finita!? Indes führt Heinz Schreckenberg viele bedeutende Gelehrte an, die sich kritisch zu Nieses Edition geäußert haben, und er hofft, „die aus Unkenntnis noch vielerorts verbreitete Ansicht zu revidieren, daß Nieses Edition beinahe kanonische Geltung beanspruchen könne“.¹² Es regt demgegenüber zum Nachdenken an, wenn man erfährt, daß eine der letzten Äußerungen des verdienstvollen Herausgebers selbst zu seinem Werk lautet: „It need hardly be said that the work of textual criticism is still far from complete; it is only now, in fact, that it can really begin.“¹³ Das wurde vor mehr als 60 Jahren geschrieben, und die hier gestellte Aufgabe ist noch nicht erfüllt, ja sogar nicht einmal ernst in Angriff genommen worden. Aber ich möchte hier nicht wiederholen, was bereits so deutlich und überzeugend von Heinz Schreckenberg ausgeführt worden ist.¹⁴

Hat Josephus es uns zu leicht gemacht? In Qumran wurden und werden neue Texte entdeckt, und das Neue übt immer ungeheuerere Anziehungskraft aus, während Josephus, nun ja, schon so lange, beinahe langweilig lange bekannt ist. Zudem: Qumran gab viele sprachliche und exegetische Probleme auf; der jüdische Historiker aber schrieb ein klares Griechisch ohne viele Schwierigkeiten. Und doch läßt sich fragen, ob wir wirklich schon erfaßt

12 H. Schreckenberg, *Flavius-Josephus-Tradition*, S. 5.

13 H. Schreckenberg, *a.a.O.*, S. 4.

14 H. Schreckenberg, *a.a.O.*, S. 5 ff.

haben, was Josephus seinen Zeitgenossen, seinen Adressaten zu verstehen gab. Ich werde später an einigen Beispielen erläutern, wieviel in dieser Hinsicht noch zu tun ist.

Man kann nicht sagen, daß dieser Repräsentant des Judentums—denn so hat Josephus sich doch selbst betrachtet—in der zweiten Hälfte des 1. Jahrhunderts—also als Zeitgenosse der Kirche in der ersten und zweiten Generation—an dem Aufschwung, den die Studien dieser Zeit in unserem Jahrhundert genommen haben, einen nennenswerten Anteil gehabt hat. Wenn man die Bibliographie durchblättert und eine grobe Einteilung macht, dann sieht man, daß die Periode bis 1900 den Raum von 138 Seiten einnimmt, daß die Abhandlungen aus der Zeit 1900–1945 auf 103 Seiten gebracht werden und die, welche zwischen 1945 und 1970 erschienen sind, auf 71 Seiten. Das ist natürlich eine sehr grobe Einteilung; aber sie ist m. E. doch wohl ziemlich aufschlußreich für die wirkliche Sachlage: Der Fluß geht weiter, aber sehr, sehr ruhig. Es ist auch interessant zu sehen, daß bestimmte Themata immer wieder verhandelt werden, vor allem natürlich das *Testimonium Flavianum* über Jesus und auch Josephus' Berichte über die jüdischen *haireseis*; vielleicht könnte man noch seine Berichte über die Stellung der Juden im Römischen Reich hinzufügen. Aber ausführliche Bücher und Studien sind ihm und seinen Werken ziemlich selten gewidmet worden. Das eine oder das andere Thema wurde aufgegriffen, und das Resultat solcher Untersuchungen wurde auch zur Kenntnis genommen; aber das war dann auch alles.

Nun gut, Josephus wird richtig als ein Vertreter des hellenistischen Judentums bezeichnet. Wird er aber auch als solcher gewürdigt? Wenn man einen Vergleich mit Philo anstellt, ist das Ergebnis doch sehr auffallend und gereicht in jeder Hinsicht Josephus zum Nachteil. Man kann natürlich auch sagen, daß der Historiker Josephus eben kein Philosoph war, deshalb nicht so befruchtend gewirkt hat wie der Alexandriner und auch nicht Anlaß gab, seinem Verhältnis zu Vorgängern und Zeitgenossen nachzuspüren.

Daran ist gewiß etwas Richtiges. Hat man es sich aber nicht trotzdem mit Josephus bisher etwas zu leicht gemacht?

Ein Historiker, vor allem im Altertum, ist nicht nur ein Darsteller und Übermittler von Geschichte und Geschichten. Er hat mehr zu sagen; er hat eine Botschaft für das eine oder andere Niveau der menschlichen Existenz zu bringen, nicht zum Vergnügen, sondern zum gemeinen Nutzen. Jedenfalls hat Josephus selbst sich so gesehen, wie aus der Vorrede zu seinen *Antiquitates* hervorgeht. Ein Historiker kann mit anderen Fachgenossen verglichen werden, und Josephus hat sogar selbst deutlich ausgesprochen, daß er sich mit bestimmten anderen Historikern in Konkurrenz weiß. Josephus steht auch mit den geistigen Strömungen seiner Zeit in enger Beziehung, und auch in dieser

Hinsicht ist noch weit mehr zu unternehmen, als es in dem schon sechzig Jahre alten Buch von B. Brüne¹⁵ geschehen ist. Vor allem sollten die Anschauungen des Josephus als die eines hellenistischen Juden viel mehr in der Weite und in der Tiefe dargestellt werden, als das in Adolf Schlatters vor vierzig Jahren erschienenem und verdienstvollem Werk¹⁶ geschah. Wenn ich also die bis heute geleistete Arbeit an Josephus durchmustere, dann kann nur der Schluß gezogen werden, daß sie in manchen Stücken zwar sehr nützlich ist, daß aber noch sehr viel im kleinen wie im großen zu tun übrig geblieben ist, ja daß man eigentlich ruhig sagen kann, er sei vernachlässigt. Man braucht, um noch dies hervorzuheben, nur einen Vergleich zwischen dem Studium der Werke des jüdischen Historikers und dem des zeitgenössischen I. Klemensbriefes zu ziehen, um den Unterschied zu sehen und zu sagen, daß hier nur erst ein kleiner Anfang gemacht worden ist—*salvo honore* derer, die hierzu ihre Kraft gegeben haben.

Woher nun stammt diese Vernachlässigung eigentlich? Eine Ursache wurde schon oben erwähnt: Josephus als Historiker scheint es einem leicht zu machen; denn er schreibt seine Erzählungen in einem nicht sehr schwierigen Griechisch, und deshalb scheinen ausführliche Kommentare überflüssig zu sein.

Bemerkenswerterweise hat Heinz Schreckenberg noch auf einen weiteren Grund hingewiesen, wenn er sich fragt, in welches Fachgebiet Josephus eigentlich hineingehöre.¹⁷ Ist er nicht etwa—wie wir sagen—zwischen zwei Stühle gefallen, nämlich die Alte Geschichte und die Theologie?

Vielleicht kann man sogar noch mehr nennen. Ich muß allerdings bekennen, daß ich die hier aufgeworfene Frage etwas unangebracht finde, weil sie von einer falschen Voraussetzung ausgeht. Studienobjekte sind nämlich nicht bestimmten Fachgebieten unterworfen, sondern umgekehrt: Fachgebiete sind ihrem Wesen nach Notbehelfe, die aus unserer Beschränktheit, die nicht alles umfassen kann, erwachsen, weil Spezialisierung nur einem besseren Erfassen des Ganzen dient. Glücklicherweise gibt es heute im ganzen Gebiet der Wissenschaft ein tieferes Verständnis für die Wichtigkeit interdisziplinärer Untersuchungen. Beim Studium des Josephus soll man deshalb nicht fragen, in welches Fachgebiet er eigentlich gehört, sondern von welchem Fach oder von welchen Fächern man die nötigen Informationen bekommen kann, um

15 B. Brüne, *Flavius Josephus und seine Schriften in ihrem Verhältnis zum Judentume, zur griechisch-römischen Welt und zum Christentume mit griechischer Wortkordanz zum Neuen Testamente und I. Clemensbriefe nebst Sach- und Namen-Verzeichnis*. Gütersloh 1913.

16 A. Schlatter, *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josefus*, Gütersloh 1932.

17 H. Schreckenberg, *Bibliographie*, S. VIII f.

ihn zu erklären. Auch hier muß nicht weniger als in der Gnosis-Forschung, wo es selbstverständlich geworden ist, aus vielen Richtungen die Aufhellung kommen.

Es darf wohl noch einiges mehr angemerkt werden. Für die klassische Philologie gehört Josephus natürlich in die Spätzeit der griechischen Literatur und hier wieder nicht eben zu den interessantesten Autoren; nicht ohne Folgen hat die griechische Literatur der Kaiserzeit, soweit sie nicht für die Philosophie von Bedeutung ist, lange Zeit unter dem Verdikt „nicht-klassisch“ gestanden. Andererseits hat man bei den Theologen oft den Eindruck, daß es ihnen sehr schwer fällt, über den Zaun ihres jüdisch-christlichen Erbes hinauszuschauen, selbst wenn der Gegenstand, der ihrer Aufmerksamkeit wert ist, ganz nahe, allerdings vielleicht ein wenig um die Ecke liegt.

Im Falle des Josephus kommt noch ein besonderes Handikap dazu. Der englische Forscher Thackeray, der sich große Verdienste um Josephus erworben hat—im Vorübergehen darf wohl bemerkt werden, daß er weder Theologe noch klassischer Philologe war, sondern ein Regierungsbeamter—schrieb in seinem Buch „Josephus, the Man and the Historian“ in bezug auf die *Antiquitates*: „I may pass lightly over the earlier portion, based mainly on the Biblical record.“¹⁸ Obwohl er später näher über den biblischen Text und seine Interpretation bei Josephus spricht, ist es doch merkwürdig, daß er hier nur wie nebenbei von den ersten elf Büchern dieses Werkes, d. h. von mehr als der Hälfte, spricht. Das erscheint mir in gewisser Hinsicht als bezeichnend. Man hat eben doch so ein leichtes, undeutliches Gefühl: Hier gilt es nur wenig oder gar nichts zu lernen, da wir Josephus' Quelle zur Hand haben und ein Auszug, wie er ihn liefert, höchstens eine Paraphrase, nichts Ergiebiges ist. Es ist ja auch so: Wenn man mehr von Mose oder David oder über die Königszeit wissen möchte, wird man schnell enttäuscht; denn der Historiker aus dem letzten Viertel des I. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. hatte eben kein anderes Material als das, was das Alte Testament enthält. Ist das aber der einzige oder wichtigste Gesichtspunkt? Ich denke: nein. Man darf einen so großen Komplex, der für Josephus selbst so bedeutsam war, faktisch nicht außer Betracht lassen, wie es oft geschieht. Ich bin fest überzeugt, daß genaue Interpretation gerade dieser Bücher uns viel Belehrung schenken wird, zwar nicht über Mose und David, wohl aber über Josephus und seine Botschaft, und das ist doch höchst wichtig. Hoffentlich wird sich also die hier beschriebene Lage in der Zukunft ändern! Jedenfalls ist es die Absicht dieser Vorlesungen, dazu beizutragen und einige Pfade zu weisen. Dabei bin ich dessen gewiß, daß das Erscheinen der Konkordanz ein unentbehrliches und fruchtbares Hilfsmittel für die Forschung

18 H.St.J. Thackeray, *Josephus. The Man and the Historian*, New York 1929, p. 58.

sein wird. Denn nach meinem Dafürhalten kann noch sehr vieles von den Äckern des Josephus geerntet werden, das zu einem besseren Verständnis seiner Zeit und deren geistigen Strömungen beitragen kann.

Soeben sprachen wir von der Vernachlässigung der ersten elf Bücher der *Antiquitates Judaicae*. Dazu möchte ich es natürlich nicht unterlassen, zu erwähnen, daß etliche Stücke aus ihnen bereits gründlich bearbeitet worden sind. Vor allem denke ich dabei an die Bearbeitung der Joseph-Geschichte durch Martin Braun und Hans Sprödowsky.¹⁹ Auch ist die umfangreiche Monographie über Josephus' Verwendung des Aristeebriefs von André Pelletier zu erwähnen.²⁰ Im ersten Falle ist das Studium den literarischen und den kulturellen Problemen gewidmet, im zweiten den sprachlichen. Aus diesen Arbeiten geht klar hervor, wie viel noch auf anderen Gebieten zu tun, aber auch wie vielversprechend die Arbeit ist. In den nächsten Vorlesungen möchte ich meinerseits versuchen, dies auf etwas anderen Wegen an Hand von zwei Beispielen zu zeigen.

Am Ende dieser ersten Vorlesung scheint es mir angebracht zu sein, zunächst an Hand einiger Beispiele nachzuweisen, wie durch ein genaues Beobachten des Wortgebrauchs die Sprache unseres Historikers erhellt und wie Zusammenhänge seines Denkens und seiner Kultur zum Vorschein gebracht werden können.

Das *erste Beispiel* ist dem *Proömium* der *Antiquitates* entlehnt (§ 9–11). In dieser Vorrede sagt Josephus, daß er von verschiedenen Seiten ermuntert worden sei, die alte Geschichte seines Volkes zu beschreiben. Bei seinen Überlegungen, ob er es tun solle oder nicht, hat er sich auch die Frage überlegt, was seine Voreltern getan hätten: Wären sie bereit gewesen, den Inhalt der Heiligen Schriften mitzuteilen (εἰ μεταδιδόναι τῶν ποιούτων ἥθειλον)? Er denkt dann daran, wie die Septuaginta zustande gekommen ist: wie der ägyptische König den Hohenpriester gebeten hatte, das jüdische Gesetz und seine Staatsbegründung in die griechische Sprache zu übersetzen, und wie der Hohepriester, der in der Tugend hinter niemand zurückstand, „dem König diesen Nutzen zu genießen nicht mißgönnte und es doch bestimmt verweigert haben würde, wenn es in unserem Volk nicht Tradition gewesen wäre, von diesen herrlichen Sachen nichts geheim zu halten“ (τῷ προειρημένῳ βασιλεῖ ταύτης ἀπολαύσαι τῆς ὠφελείας οὐκ ἐφθόνησε, πάντως ἀντειπὼν ἂν εἰ μὴ πάτριον ἦν ἡμῖν τὸ

19 M. Braun, *Griechischer Roman und hellenistische Geschichtsschreibung*. Frankfurt am Main 1934; H. Sprödowsky, *Die Hellenisierung der Geschichte von Joseph in Ägypten bei Flavius Josephus*. Greifswald 1937.

20 A. Pelletier, *Flavius Josèphe adaptateur de la Lettre d'Aristée. Une réaction atticisme contre la KOINE*, Paris 1962.

μηδὲν ἔχειν τῶν καλῶν ἀπόρρητον). Deshalb faßt Josephus den Entschluß, dem Vorbild des Hohenpriesters zu folgen. Auf den ersten Blick scheint hier nichts Besonderes vorzuliegen, sondern nur ein kurzer Hinweis auf die Entstehung der Septuaginta. Aber der Schein trügt. Josephus verwendet hier vier Wörter, die, im Licht ihrer Zeit gelesen, zu einem einzigen Gedankenkomplex gehören: μεταδιδόναι—ὠφέλεια—οὐκ ἐφθόνησε—ἀπόρρητον.

In einer Untersuchung über ἀφθόνως μεταδίδωμι habe ich kürzlich das Material aus der antiken Literatur zum Beweis dieser These vorgelegt.²¹ Das braucht hier nicht wiederholt zu werden. Jetzt genügt es, das Resultat zusammenzufassen: Wie bekannt, gab es in der Antike eine weitverbreitete Geheimwissenschaft, deren Kenntnis von den Inhabern (Priestern, Magiern, Weisheitslehrern) streng gehütet und keinem Uneingeweihten zugänglich gemacht wurde. Von Leuten, die im Gegensatz hierzu großzügig und uneigennützig all ihr Heilswissen zum Nutzen ihrer Mitmenschen zur Verfügung stellten, wurde gesagt, daß sie ἀφθόνως verführen. Das eben, so wird jetzt gegen diesen Hintergrund ganz klar, sagt Josephus hier von den Juden in Beziehung auf ihre Heiligen Schriften. Bei ihnen war es eben Tradition (πάτριον), nichts geheim (ἀπόρρητον, bekannter Terminus der Mysteriensprache) zu halten. Diese Versicherung, daß die Heilslehre der Juden immer ganz offen den Griechen mitgeteilt wurde, hat natürlich auch eine polemische Spitze im Strudel der geistigen Strömungen der Zeit. Josephus übernimmt sie für seine Person am Anfang seiner Geschichtsschreibung. Sie enthält für ihn die unerläßliche Autorisierung zu seinem Werk aus seinem jüdischen Erbe heraus und ist zugleich ein Hinweis auf seine Zuverlässigkeit.

Ein zweites Beispiel entnehmen wir der Danielsgeschichte (*Ant. Jud.* X 241). Es handelt sich um die Wiedergabe der Szene durch Josephus, in der der König Belsazar dem Daniel sein Angebot machte, als er von seinen Magiern keine Deutung der geheimnisvollen Buchstaben auf der Mauer bekommen konnte (*Dan.* 5,5 ff.). Der Prophet schlägt das Angebot des Fürsten, der ihm viele herrliche Geschenke anbietet, mit den Worten aus: τὰ δόματά σου σοι ἔστω, καὶ τὴν δωρεάν τῆς οἰκίας σου ἐτέρῳ δός (*Vs.* 17 Theodotion). Josephus paraphrasiert den Satz in dieser Weise: „Daniel ersuchte ihn, die Geschenke für sich zu behalten, und fügte hinzu: Denn das Weis und Göttliche ist unbestechlich und hilft unentgeltlich den Bedürftigen“ (τὸ γὰρ σοφὸν καὶ θεῖον ἀδωροδόκητον εἶναι καὶ προίκα τοὺς δεομένους ὠφελεῖν). Von diesem Zusatz liest man im Alten Testament

21 W.C. van Unnik, ΑΦΘΟΝΩΣ ΜΕΤΑΔΙΔΩΜΙ, in: *Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België*, Klasse der Letteren, XXXIII (1971), nr. 4, Brussel 1971 (über Josephus, blz. 31–34).

kein Wort, und doch macht er mit seiner *oratio obliqua* den Eindruck, als ob er zu der Rede Daniels dort gehörte.

Woher stammt dieser Zusatz? Natürlich aus der Feder des Josephus. Aber weshalb hat er ihn hinzugefügt? Es mag scheinen, er habe in dieser Weise eine unbegreifliche Tat oder eine anscheinende Unhöflichkeit Daniels zu erläutern versuchen wollen. Aber damit ist nicht das Richtige getroffen. Es handelt sich hier um die Auslegung eines Orakels, und Daniel ist ein Instrument zu seiner Erklärung; denn „der göttliche Geist steht ihm bei, und er allein ist am besten im Stande herauszufinden, was den anderen nicht in den Sinn kommt“ (§ 239). Die ihm angebotenen Schätze könnten den Charakter von Bestechungsgeld haben. Nun gab es im Altertum einen heftigen Kampf, ob man für geistige Gaben Geld annehmen dürfe, was meistens verneint wurde, und es gab viele Geschichten von der Bestechlichkeit der Orakel, so auch in den berühmten Worten des Sophocles, *Antigone* 1055: τὸ μαντικὸν γὰρ πᾶν φιλόργυρον γένος.²² Im Hinblick auf diese geläufige Auffassung seiner Zeitgenossen hat Josephus seine Zugabe formuliert: Der Gott Daniels wie des Josephus ist nicht wie die Orakelgötter des Hellenismus bestechlich; er gibt und hilft umsonst. Wieder wird, wenn die Aussage in ihrem richtigen Kontext gelesen wird, die polemische und konfessionelle Spitze sichtbar. Josephus brauchte das nicht speziell zu unterstreichen; denn seine Leser waren mit dieser Frage bekannt.

Als *drittes Beispiel* nehme ich das weithin bekannte Zeugnis des Josephus über die Bücher seiner Heiligen Schrift, c. *Apionem* I 8. Diese Stelle wird in allen Einleitungen zum Alten Testament erwähnt; aber sie ist m. W. nie speziell unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Terminologie untersucht worden. Und doch ist sie in dieser Hinsicht so ergiebig, daß wir sie nicht nur hier, sondern auch in den beiden folgenden Vorträgen betrachten müssen. Es nimmt natürlich nicht wunder, daß der Verfasser in dieser direkten Apologie seines Volkes, die aus der Auseinandersetzung mit einem hellenistischen Rhetor geboren ist, sich der Terminologie seines Gegners wie seines Leserkreises bedient und daß deshalb die Beziehungen zum Sprachgebrauch des Hellenismus hier sehr wichtig sind. Man kann sich nur darüber wundern, daß dem noch kaum Aufmerksamkeit geschenkt worden ist.

Aber nun zur Sache, auf die es hier ankommt! Im Eingang seiner Verteidigungsrede legt Josephus dar, daß die grundlegenden Schriften seines Volkes viel älter sind als die der Griechen und daß sie mit höchster Sorgfalt gepflegt und tradiert sind. An unserer Stelle betont er, daß diese Schriften durch göttliche Inspiration zustande gekommen sind, und nennt noch ein zweites

22 Das hierzu gehörige Quellenmaterial hoffe ich in einer Abhandlung unter dem Titel „*Evangelium gratis dandum*“ zu veröffentlichen.

Charakteristikum: „In diesen Schriften besteht keine Disharmonie“ (μήτε τινὸς ἐν τοῖς γραφομένοις ἐνούσης διαφωνίας), und etwas weiter: „Bei uns besteht keine Unzahl von Büchern, die ohne Einklang und miteinander unverträglich sind“ (οὐ μυριάδες βιβλίων εἰσι παρ’ ἡμῖν ἀσυμφώνων καὶ μαχομένων), und darin sieht er ein Zeichen der Zuverlässigkeit. Daneben möchte ich—um nur einiges zu nennen, erwähnen, was er später in diesem Zusammenhang schreibt. In I 143 f. sagt er nach Anführung des babylonischen Historikers Berossos, daß seine Geschichte als zuverlässig (ἀξιόπιστον) betrachtet werden könne, weil in den Archiven der Phönizier damit übereinstimmende (σύμφωνα) Berichte gefunden würden, und daß auch der Geschichtsschreiber Philostratus damit übereinstimme (συμφωνεῖ). Berossos ist Kronzeuge: „Das stimmt überein mit unseren Schriften und umfaßt die Wahrheit“ (ταῦτα σύμφωνον ἔχει ταῖς ἡμετέραις βίβλοις τὴν ἀλήθειαν, c. Ap. I 154). In Josephus’ Beweisführung spielt also die „Übereinstimmung“, die *symphonia*, eine bedeutende Rolle: sie ist Zeuge der Wahrheit, während ihre Abwesenheit die Lügner entlarvt.

Auch in diesem Falle würde es zu weit führen, wollte ich umständlich belegen, daß hier ein bei den Hellenisten geläufiges Merkmal der Verifikation vorliegt. Josephus stellt solche Kriterien nicht persönlich auf, sondern gebraucht die Maßstäbe seiner Zeit. Natürlich erhebt sich dann die interessante Frage, wie sich das *in concreto* bei diesen Schriften auswirkt. Gibt es da keine Gegensätze? Die Antwort kann nur in der Form einer These gegeben werden: Die *Symphonie* betrifft die Fundamentallehren und die großen Linien, nicht kleine Besonderheiten in der Formulierung usw.; wenn da die Symphonie gefunden wird, ist sie Zeuge der Wahrheit.

Hier müssen wir abbrechen. Auf einem Gebiet, das mir sehr am Herzen liegt, habe ich gezeigt, wie viel hier noch zu tun ist. Denn meine Beispiele waren keine Ausnahmen, sondern typisch. Sie waren ganz willkürlich ausgewählt. Man kann natürlich andere Gebiete aussuchen. Hier aber ist m. E. die Aufgabe nicht nur sehr dringlich, sondern auch schwierig; denn man muß nicht nur bei Josephus, sondern auch in der weit zerstreuten hellenistischen Literatur beheimatet sein. Aber die Aufgabe ist lohnend. Das Josephus-Studium mag in vieler Hinsicht vernachlässigt sein; es ist aber eine Arbeit, die schöne Früchte trägt, die auch für den Neutestamentler wertvoll sind.²³

23 Erst nachdem diese Vorlesungen ausgearbeitet waren, erschien das Buch von H. Lindner, *Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im Bellum Judaicum*. Leiden 1972. Nur an einer einzigen Stelle in den Anmerkungen habe ich darauf noch hinweisen können.

II Die Formel „nichts wegnehmen, nichts hinzufügen“ bei Josephus

Der englische Historiker Arnold J. Toynbee, der nach dem 2. Weltkrieg durch seine kühnen Geschichtsentwürfe berühmt wurde, die er mit großem Sachwissen und mit Wagemut in der stattlichen Reihe der Bände seiner „A Study of History“ entwickelte, hat in seiner Anfangszeit zu einer englischen Serie „A Library of Greek Thought“ unter dem Titel: „Greek Historical Thought“ einen Beitrag geliefert, der 1952 in den USA mit neuem Vorwort als „A Mentor Book“²⁴ neu veröffentlicht wurde.

Mit ausgezeichnetem Kennerblick hat Toynbee in diesem Buch ausgewählte Stellen in Übersetzung gesammelt, die Zeugnis von den Kräften ablegen, von denen sich die griechischen Historiker bei ihren Darstellungen haben leiten lassen. Der erste Teil dieser Sammlung ist den Proömien gewidmet, in denen die Geschichtsschreiber ihre Zielsetzungen darstellen. Unter ihnen hat nach Herodot, Thucydides, Polybius, Dionysius von Halicarnassus, Diodorus Siculus und dem Evangelisten Lukas auch Josephus seinen Platz gefunden. Das ist ganz mit Recht geschehen. Der jüdische Priestersohn²⁵ hat sich nämlich des öfteren über seine Absichten ausgesprochen und sich dabei bewußt an hellenistisch gebildete Leser gewendet, obwohl er im ersten Buch seines *Contra Apionem* gleich zu Anfang deutlich eine orientalische Tradition der Geschichtsschreibung von der griechischen unterscheidet. Natürlich konnte in einer derartigen Auswahl keine Vollständigkeit angestrebt werden. Es ist aber doch schade, daß Toynbee, wahrscheinlich aus Raumgründen, nicht auch Josephus' Vorwort zu seinem zweiten Hauptwerk, den *Antiquitates Judaicae*, aufgenommen hat: denn dies Proömium weist eine Anzahl von Zügen auf, die ihm ein eigenes Gepräge geben.

War das *Bellum Judaicum* geschrieben, um das jüdische Volk nach der Niedermetzlung des großen Aufstandes gegen Verleumdungen zu schützen, und dient die Schrift *Contra Apionem* dazu, das hohe Alter und damit die große Bedeutung des jüdischen Volkes gegen allerhand Verunglimpfung zu erweisen, so hat Josephus mit der Abfassung seiner *Altertümer* apologetische Zwecke dieser Art nicht beabsichtigt. Im Anfang seiner Vorrede betont er einmal, er habe den *Jüdischen Krieg* dargestellt, um die Wahrheit ans Licht zu bringen. Damit wählt er das für ihn und seine Sache bedeutsame Motiv aus den von ihm erwähnten Möglichkeiten der hellenistischen Geschichtsschreibung.²⁶

24 A. J. Toynbee, *Greek Historical Thought*. New edition, Mentor Book, New York 1952.

25 Josephus. *Vita* I ff.; c. *Apionem* I 54; *Bell. Jud.* I 3.

26 P. Scheller, *De Hellenistica historiae conscribendae arte*, Leipzig 1911 (Dissertation), p. 72 s. s.; G. Avenarius, *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung*, Meisenheim/Glan 1956. S. 13 ff.

Er hatte sich zuerst vorgenommen, die Geschichte seines Volkes von Anfang an darzustellen, aber dann eingesehen, so wäre das Werk zu umfangreich geworden. Nachdem er diese Arbeit, die wohl griechische Leser interessieren mochte, aufgeschoben hatte, weil sie seine Kräfte, vor allem in sprachlicher Hinsicht, überstieg, hat er sie schließlich doch wiederaufgenommen. So möchte er gern die Staatseinrichtung und die großartige Geschichte seines Volkes den wissensbedürftigen Griechen zugänglich machen und damit dem Beispiel seiner Vorfahren nachfolgen, die durch die Übersetzung für Ptolemäus II. das Gesetz den Fremden bekanntzumachen versuchten. Aber neben dem Gesetz umfassen die heiligen Bücher des Judentums auch viele eindrucksvolle und bedeutende Geschichten. Vor allem jedoch lehrt die Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes, daß Gehorsam gegenüber Gott höchstes Glück bringt, Übertretung seines Gesetzes aber das Umgekehrte, nämlich schreckliches Unheil. Der große Gesetzgeber Moses hat deshalb Gott als Inhaber der Tugend (*areté*) gezeichnet und den Menschen verpflichtet, dieser Tugend nachzustreben.

Es würde sich sehr lohnen, Josephus in seinen Ausführungen weiter zu folgen, um vor allem seine Stellung in der griechischen Historiographie aufzuzeigen. Die Zeit reicht dazu leider nicht aus. Doch dürfte schon aus dieser kurzen Zusammenfassung deutlich geworden sein, daß der Verfasser mit seiner umfassenden Darstellung nicht nur eine Geschichte vom ersten Anfang an bis zu seiner Zeit—5000 Jahre, wie er sagt—beschreiben will, sondern auch eine „erbauliche“ Absicht verfolgt: Gesetz und Geschichte sind der Ausbildung der *areté* dienlich; Gott besitzt ja die *areté* in voller Reinheit, und der Mensch soll, angespornt und gewarnt durch die Geschichte, versuchen, sie zu erwerben (*Ant. Jud.* I 23: ὁ δ' ἡμέτερος νομοθέτης ἀκραιφνήν τὴν ἀρετὴν ἔχοντα τὸν θεὸν ἀποφύνας ὥσθι δεῖν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐκείνης πειρᾶσθαι μεταλαμβάνειν). So wird der Nutzen der Geschichte ins Moralische und Nützliche gewendet.

Aber mit dieser Charakteristik ist der Aussagewille des Josephus wohl noch nicht ganz im Sinne des Josephus selbst gekennzeichnet. Wichtig und bemerkenswert scheint mir zu sein: Josephus meint das alles streng theozentrisch. Auf Gottes Wesen (φύσις) wird immer als ersten Ursprung und letztes Ziel hingewiesen. Glück und Unglück folgen nicht automatisch auf Gehorsam und Sünde, sondern kommen von Gott (I 14). Es gilt, Gottes Wesen wahrzunehmen, seine Werke im Geiste zu beobachten; dann kann er als Beispiel nachgeahmt werden (I 19: θεοῦ . . . φύσιν κατανοῆσαι καὶ τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἐκείνου θεατὴν τῷ νῷ γενόμενον οὕτως παράδειγμα τὸ πάντων ἄριστον μιμεῖσθαι). Das Verhalten des Menschen gegenüber dem Gott der *areté* und dessen Reaktion auf menschliche Taten—solches zu erkennen und zu verstehen anzuleiten, ist das Ziel der Archäologie des Josephus.

In das Sprachgewand seiner Zuhörer hüllt Josephus seine Gedanken. Hätten wir Zeit, so könnten wir vor allem an der Polemik, die auch hier hörbar wird, zeigen, wie er dabei auch eine eigene Stellung einnimmt und die Herrlichkeit des Gesetzes Moses ans Licht zu bringen versucht. Leider muß das unterbleiben; denn wir müssen jetzt unsere Aufmerksamkeit auf einen Ausdruck richten, den Josephus in Zusammenhang mit seinen Quellen gebraucht und der für seine Art der Darstellung von großer Wichtigkeit ist.

Ant. Jud. I 5 sagt Josephus, er habe seine geschichtliche Darstellung angefangen in der Meinung, es sei der Mühe wert, diese geschichtliche Welt allen Griechen zu zeigen; „denn sie wird unsere ganz alte Geschichte und unsere Staatseinrichtung umfassen, übersetzt aus den hebräischen Schriften“ (περιέξειν ἅπασαν τὴν παρ’ ἡμῖν ἀρχαιολογίαν καὶ διάταξιν τοῦ πολιτεύματος ἐκ τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν μεθρημηνευμένην γραμμάτων). Er hat lange gezögert, einen so großen Plan in einer anderen als der eigenen Sprache auszuführen (I 7: μέλλησις ἐγένετο τηλικαύτην μετενεγκεῖν ὑπόθεσιν εἰς ἄλλοδαπὴν ἡμῖν καὶ ξένης διαλέκτου συνήθειαν). Das Drängen von Leuten, die die Geschichte kennenzulernen wünschten, hat ihm aber weitergeholfen. Er möchte dem Beispiel des Hohenpriesters Eleazar nachfolgen, der gezeigt hat, daß es nicht die Gewohnheit der Juden sei, das Edle geheimzuhalten (I 11: πάτριον ἦν ἡμῖν τὸ μηδὲν ἔχειν τῶν καλῶν ἀπόρρητον).²⁷ Indes wurde damals nur das Gesetz übersetzt; aber in den heiligen Büchern war doch noch unendlich viel mehr dargestellt.

Man fragt sich, wenn man dies zur Kenntnis nimmt, ob Josephus wirklich nur eine griechische Übersetzung des Pentateuchs zur Hand gehabt und das übrige der heiligen Schriften selbst in griechischer Sprache bearbeitet hat. Meistens wird ohne weiteres angenommen, er habe mit einer Büchersammlung, die der heutigen Septuaginta ähnelte, gearbeitet. Aber es scheint doch, als ob er—abgesehen von der Pentateuch-Übersetzung—selbst übersetzt hat. Hier liegt jedenfalls eine gewichtige Frage vor. Nun läßt sich darauf hinweisen, daß Josephus in *Ant. Jud.* X 210 den Leser, falls er genau über den Stein in Dan. 2, 40 Bescheid erhalten möchte, dazu ermuntert, das Buch des Propheten selbst zu lesen. Daraus könnte man nämlich schließen, daß das Buch Daniel auch Nichtjuden zugänglich war. Aber vielleicht hat die Aufforderung σπουδασάτω „er mag sich Mühe geben“ einen tieferen Sinn, sofern sie nicht nur „aufsuchen“, sondern „nachsuchen in einer fremden Sprache“ im Auge hat. Josephus spricht jedenfalls etwas später (X 218) über seine Arbeit in folgender Weise: „... daß ich nur die hebräischen Bücher in griechischer Sprache wiedergebe (μεταφράζειν)“. Man darf dazu nicht übersehen, wie Josephus am Ende seiner

27 Vgl. oben S. 22 f.; s. auch Josephus. *Ant. Jud.* XII 15.

Archäologie die Arbeit abschließt. Mit selbstbewußtem Stolz (λέγω θαρρήσας) erklärt er (XX 262), daß außer ihm niemand unter den Juden und den anderen Einwohnern Palästinas²⁸ zu ihr imstande gewesen wäre, wenn er diese geschichtliche Abhandlung²⁹ hätte zu den Griechen bringen oder vielleicht besser „den Griechen hätte offenbaren wollen“ (εἰς Ἑλλήνας ἐξενεγκεῖν).³⁰ Wie konnte er das sagen, wenn es jedem Griechen, der es wünschte, möglich gewesen wäre, in einer Synagoge die heiligen Schriften der Juden kennenzulernen? Sollen wir annehmen, daß diese Schriften so aufbewahrt wurden, daß es für Außenstehende unmöglich war, den Inhalt zu wissen? Oder waren die griechischen Adressaten, die Josephus im Auge hatte, wohl im allgemeinen am Phänomen des Judentums interessiert, empfanden aber den Abstand als zu groß und die heiligen Schriften als zu verworren, als daß sie es der Mühe für wert gehalten hätten, sich persönlich zu informieren, und wünschten sie deshalb eine zusammenhängende Geschichte, eine Art von Laienbibel, unseren Kinderbibeln vergleichbar? Es ist doch merkwürdig, daß Josephus von den Propheten nur das mitteilt, was unmittelbar geschichtlich erzählt werden konnte, und daß er die Psalmen und die Sprüche wohl erwähnt, aber nichts daraus anführt.

Wie dem auch sei, hier liegen einige Probleme, die für das Verständnis der Arbeit des Josephus und für die von ihm beabsichtigte Wirkung von Bedeutung zu sein scheinen. Deshalb verdienen sie eine genauere Untersuchung, als ihnen bis heute zuteil wurde.

Josephus will—wie bereits gesagt wurde—die Tatsachen der Geschichte seines Volkes im Widerspruch zu allerhand Verleumdungen und Klatsch mitteilen, zwar nicht in direkter Apologie, aber doch in faktischer Berichterstattung, „wie es eigentlich gewesen ist“, und unter dem Gesichtspunkt, was diese Geschichte die Menschen lehrt. Nun macht er in seiner Vorrede über seinen Gebrauch der Quellen eine merkwürdige Aussage, die wohl beachtet werden

28 Er gebraucht im Zusammenhang das Wort ἀλλόφυλος; vgl. da7u F. Büchsel, in: G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Bd. I. Stuttgart 1933, S. 267, s. v.

29 πραγματεία: vgl. auch *Ant. Jud.* I prooemium 17 (diese Stelle wird unten im Text abgedruckt, S. 29) und dazu H.G. Liddell – R. Scott – H.St. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*⁹. Oxford 1940, p. 1457, s.v. III 3 „systematic or scientific historical treatise“.

30 Im Sinne von „offenbaren“, s. viele interessante Stellen bei O. Casel, *De philosophorum Graecorum silentio mystico*, Gießen 1919, S. 161, Index s. v. ἐκφέρειν. Man vgl. damit, daß oben von ἀπόρρητα die Rede war. Von Bedeutung ist auch *Epistula Aristeae* 315 über den griechischen Geschichtsschreiber Theopompus, der wahnsinnig geworden war und um Genesung bat: δι' ὄνειρον δὲ σημανθέντος, ὅτι τὰ θεῖα βούλεται περιεργασάμενος εἰς κοινούς ἀνθρώπους ἐκφέρειν, ἀποσχόμενον δ' οὕτως ἀποκαταστήναι (fast wörtlich übernommen von Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* XII 112).

sollte. In I 17 erklärt er, er werde den genauen Inhalt der Schriften im Gang der Erzählung mit passender Ordnung mitteilen; „denn dies habe ich durch diese geschichtliche Abhandlung zu tun versprochen, ohne etwas hinzuzufügen oder aber etwas fortzulassen“ (τὰ μὲν οὖν ἀκριβῆ τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀναγραφαῖς προϊῶν ὁ λόγος κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν τάξιν σημαίνει· τοῦτο γὰρ διὰ ταύτης ποιήσειν τῆς πραγματείας³¹ ἐπηγγειλάμην, οὐδὲν προσθεὶς οὐδ' αὖ παραλιπὼν). Wo und wann er das versprochen hat, bleibt im Dunkeln; jedenfalls steht es nicht in diesem Vorwort. War es also eine mündliche Zusage?

Aber weit wichtiger als die Antwort auf diese Frage ist die Überlegung, was der Verfasser mit den Worten οὐδὲν προσθεὶς οὐδ' αὖ παραλιπὼν gemeint hat. Denn wenn man die *Antiquitates Judaicae* liest, stellt man bald fest, daß Josephus vieles aus seinen Quellen fortgelassen und geändert hat. Er hat nicht nur eine zusammenhängende Erzählung zu schaffen versucht, und er hat nicht nur stilistisch am Wortlaut der ihm vorliegenden Geschichten gefeilt und z. B. *oratio recta* in *oratio obliqua* umgestaltet, sondern er hat auch Zusätze gemacht und Reden hinzugefügt. Es erübrigt sich wohl, Beispiele anzuführen. Fast auf jeder Seite sind sie bei ihm zu finden, auch wenn er nicht überall gleich stark eingegriffen hat. Nach meinem Dafürhalten sind es eben diese Züge, die es der Mühe wert machen, dieses Werk genau zu studieren. Dadurch kommt man nämlich seiner Arbeitsweise auf die Spur und sieht, wie ein gebildeter Jude in der subapostolischen Zeit einem heidnischen Hörerkreis die Heilige Schrift übermittelte.

Natürlich ist diese Diskrepanz zwischen dem, was er versprochen, und dem, was er tatsächlich geleistet hat, nicht unbemerkt geblieben. Schon vor einem Jahrhundert hat der holländische Josephus-Übersetzer Terwogt in einer seiner wenigen Anmerkungen darauf hingewiesen,³² und erst kürzlich hat der englische Gelehrte H.P. Kingdon diese Tatsache wieder ins Licht gerückt. In dessen Aufsatz über den Ursprung der Zeloten³³ heißt es: „The attitude of Josephus to the Old Testament passages about Yahweh's zeal is illuminating. Although he³⁴ promises to add and omit nothing in passing on Scripture records (A I. 17),

31 Vgl. oben Anm. 6.

32 W.A. Terwogt in seiner Übersetzung (s. oben S. 18 Anm. II), biz. 2, noot 4: er verweist auf *Ant. Jud.* X 218 (oben S.28) und *c. Apionen* 18 (oben S.24) und bemerkt dann: „Des te meer mag het ons verwonderen, dat hij er zoo dikwijls ontrouw aan wordt“. Das wird von Terwogt erklärt durch den Gebrauch der LXX und durch die Aufnahme von jüdischen Legenden, während Josephus „niet zelden aan zijne opsierende verbeelding den vrijen teugel laat, waar het de verheerlijking zyns volks geldt“.

33 H.P. Kingdon, *The Origins of the Zealots*, in: *New Testament Studies* 19 (1972/73). p. 74 ff.

34 Im Text: He!

in fact he shortens . . .“. Es folgen dann Beispiele, die zeigen, wie Josephus die von ihm selbst formulierte Regel nicht beobachtet hat. Später kommt Kingdon darauf zurück: „Where he did so“ (nämlich: suppressing „the bellicose implications of the LXX use of ζῆλ—for *qana* in the O. T. to depart from his text“) „(despite his assurance that he would not) he must have relied upon his mainly non-Jewish readers not referring to the biblical texts. He may have dared to do this all the more because he had largely succeeded in suppressing most of this background when he had earlier written the Jewish War; the irredentism of much of post—O. T. apocalyptic would be even less available to most of his Gentile readers.“³⁵ Der ältere Autor Terwogt urteilte, Josephus habe es mit der Wiedergabe seiner Grundlagen nicht gerade genau genommen. Kingdon aber entlarvt ihn eigentlich als Lügner und bürdet ihm eine Beschuldigung auf, die wohl zu diesem Überläufer ins römische Lager, fast möchte man sagen: zu diesem Schutzheiligen der Landesverräter, zu passen scheint. Josephus hat nach dieser Anschauung die Wahrheit bewußt unterschlagen, weil seine Leser doch nicht imstande waren, die Sache nachzuprüfen.

Eine genau entgegengesetzte Meinung wurde vor vier Jahren von dem Amerikaner L.H. Feldman vorgetragen, der durch seine Studien auf dem Gebiet des hellenistischen Judentums bekanntgeworden ist. In einem Aufsatz unter dem Titel: „Hellenizations in Josephus' Portrayal of Man's Decline“ verwies er nach Anführung einer Anzahl von bei Josephus nicht aufgenommenen Textabschnitten auf Präzedenzfälle bei Rabbinen, die auch bestimmte, meistens anstößige Stücke der Schrift unterdrückten. Dann folgerte er: „when Josephus says that he has neither added to nor subtracted from what is written, he presumably means not merely what is written in the Bible but also that which was included in the Jewish tradition of interpretation and which was regarded as an integral part of that tradition“. Etwas später kommt er wieder auf die Sache zurück und sagt ausdrücklich: „We should, I believe, take Josephus at his word that he has not added or subtracted, except insofar as he was a free translator writing as a kind of orator, defending the cause of the Jews before a Greek audience in terms intelligible to them.“³⁶

Hier hat man also zwei einander diametral entgegengesetzte Interpretationen eines Textes, der für die Beurteilung der Art, in der Josephus als Historiker selbst seine Arbeit aufgefaßt hat, überaus wichtig ist. Wie soll nun angesichts dessen die eigene Entscheidung ausfallen? Wenn man die *Antiquitates* liest und ihre Vorlagen vergleicht, sich aber nicht auf das begrenzte Gebiet

35 H.P. Kingdon, *a.a.O.*, p. 78.

36 L.H. Feldman, *a.a.O.* (oben S. 17 Anm. 9). p. 338 f.; er hat schon auf p. 336 das Faktum ohne Kommentar erwähnt.

beschränkt, das Kingdon untersucht hat, wird man dazu neigen, sein Urteil zu unterschreiben. Aber hat man dann recht geurteilt? Hat man dann Josephus verstanden *e mente auctoris*? Hätte man nur diese einzige Stelle, an der unser Historiker die Devise „nichts hinzufügen und nichts fortlassen“ nennt, dann wäre es schwierig, vielleicht sogar unmöglich, eine begründete Entscheidung zu treffen. Tatsächlich haben wir aber mehr Material. Es ist merkwürdig, daß sowohl Feldman als auch Kingdon es unterlassen haben, sich zu fragen, ob diese Erklärung im Vorwort der *Antiquitates* vereinzelt dasteht und *ad hoc* formuliert wurde oder ob sie häufiger, auch bei anderen Autoren, vorkommt und in welchem Sinn sie dort erscheint.

Die hier vorliegende Frage wird auch von A. Pelletier in der bedeutenden Arbeit mit dem Titel „Flavius Josèphe adapteur de la Lettre d'Aristée“³⁷ gestreift. In minutiöser und vorzüglicher Weise hat er untersucht, wie Josephus den Aristee-Brief verarbeitet hat, um seinen Inhalt im 12. Buch der *Antiquitates* fast vollständig zu integrieren. Das Resultat dieser Untersuchung, das für den Einblick in die Arbeitsweise des Josephus sehr bedeutsam ist, kann natürlich nur in einem größeren Zusammenhang voll gewürdigt werden. Für uns ist jetzt lediglich ein Einzelpunkt wichtig.

Am Ende des Aristee-Briefes findet sich nämlich dieselbe Wendung, deren Bedeutung bei Josephus wir zu verstehen versuchen. Nachdem die Übersetzung des Gesetzes in die griechische Sprache zustande gekommen ist, wird dort erzählt, wie die Juden Alexandrias folgendes erklärten: „Da die Übersetzung in schöner, frommer und durchaus genauer Weise gefertigt ist, so ist es recht, daß sie in diesem Wortlaut erhalten werde und keine Änderung statfinde.“ Dann läßt der Bericht den königlichen Bibliothekar Demetrius „nach ihrer Sitte“ befehlen, „den zu verfluchen, der eine Bearbeitung unternehmen werde, in der er etwas hinzusetzte oder irgend etwas von dem Geschriebenen änderte oder ausließe“. „Und das taten sie mit Recht“, sagt der Verfasser, „damit (die Schrift) beständig für alle Zukunft unverändert erhalten bliebe“.³⁸ Bei Josephus wird das wie folgt aufgenommen: Die Juden baten Demetrius, „weil die Übersetzung schön angefertigt sei, daß sie auch so, wie sie sei, erhalten werde und nicht geändert... Sie befahlen, daß, falls jemand entdeckt, daß etwas zusätzlich in das Gesetz hineingeschrieben oder etwas ausgelassen wurde, er das nach

37 A. Pelletier, *l.c.* (oben S. 22 Anm. 20).

38 Übersetzung von P. Wendland, in: E. Kautzsch, *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, Bd. II, Tübingen 1900. S. 30. Der Text von § 311 lautet: ἐκέλευσεν, διαράσασθαι, καθὼς ἔθος αὐτοῖς ἐστίν, εἴ τις διασκευάσει προστιθείς ἢ μεταφέρων τι τὸ σύνολον τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ ποιούμενος ἀφαίρεσιν, καλῶς τοῦτο πράσσοντες, ἵνα διὰ παντὸς ἀένναα καὶ μένοντα φυλάσσῃται.

abermaliger Inspektion und Bekanntmachung verbessern solle. Und daran taten sie sehr vernünftig, damit das, von dem man geurteilt hatte, es sei schön, für immer so bleibe“.³⁹

Aus dem Vergleich dieser beiden Texte ersieht man, daß Josephus den Gedanken „nichts hinzufügen, nichts fortlassen“ in einer Paraphrasierung wohl bewahrt hat, aber mit einer anderen Pointierung. Er spricht nicht von einer Verfluchung, und Pelletier bemerkt dazu: „Sans doute parce que lui-même se livre à bien des paraphrases du Pentateuque dans ses *Antiquités*“.⁴⁰ Leider hat der gelehrte Franzose nicht Josephus' Worte in *Ant. Jud.* I 17 zum Vergleich herangezogen; denn dadurch könnte doch ein anderes Licht auf das eventuelle Motiv des Josephus geworfen werden.

Der Aristeeasbrief sagt, die Verfluchung sei eine Sitte der Juden. Natürlich wird dabei immer auf die Texte Deut. 4:2 und 13:1 hingewiesen.⁴¹ Auch diese Sitte hat Josephus nicht erwähnt. Es könnte sein, daß er gesehen hat, daß in diesen Deuteronomium-Stellen von einer Verfluchung eben ganz und gar nicht die Rede ist. Er hat, wie gesagt, dem Thema „nichts hinzufügen, nichts fortlassen“ einen anderen Platz gegeben. Im Aristeeasbrief ist diese Wendung auf die Änderung des Übersetzungswerkes gemünzt, möglicherweise gegen Versuche der Samaritaner, wie Pelletier vermutet hat.⁴² Josephus rechnet deutlich nicht mit einer anderen Übersetzung, sondern mit Handschriften, in denen etwas hinzugefügt oder fortgelassen war, und zwar entweder bei der letzten Kontrolle am Anfang⁴³ oder später, und die man, wird das entdeckt, korrigieren (διορθοῦν) muß.⁴⁴ Aber das Ziel bleibt das gleiche: ἀένναα καὶ μένοντα (Aristeeas)—εἰς αἰὲ διαμένη (Jos.).

Aus diesen Stellen kann man also entnehmen, daß Josephus in seinem Proömium zu den *Antiquitates* nicht eine Aussage *ad hoc* geschaffen hat, sondern daß er mit dem Bestehen einer derartigen Formulierung bekannt war, da er sie in einer seiner Vorlagen vorfand.

39 Josephus. *Ant. Jud.* XII 109: ἐκέλευσαν (n. b. diese, Plural) εἴ τις ἢ περισσόν τι προσγεγραμμένον ὀρᾷ τῷ νόμῳ ἢ λείπον, πάλιν ἐπισκοποῦντα τοῦτο καὶ ποιοῦντα φανερόν διορθοῦν, σωφρόνως τοῦτο πράττοντες, ἵνα τὸ κριθέν ἅπαξ ἔχῃ καλῶς εἰς αἰὲ διαμένη.

40 A. Pelletier, *L.c.*, p. 189.

41 Deut. 4:2: οὐ προσθήσετε πρὸς τὸ ῥῆμα, ὃ ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ἀφελεῖτε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ· φυλάσσετε τὰς ἐντολάς κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν, ὅσα ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν σήμερον.

Deut. 13:1: πᾶν ῥῆμα ὃ ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι σοι σήμερον, τοῦτο φυλάξῃ ποιεῖν· οὐ προσθήσεις ἐπ' αὐτὸ οὐδὲ ἀφελείς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

42 A. Pelletier, *Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate*, Paris 1962, p. 234.

43 Dieser Interpretation bin ich gefolgt in meinem in Anm. 24 genannten Aufsatz.

44 Liddell-Scott. *L.c.*, p. 434, s. v. „correct or revise“.

Aber ist es nicht doch mehr als eine „formelhafte Wendung“? So urteilt jedenfalls Avenarius, unter Anführung eben der Stelle, von der wir ausgegangen sind, in seiner Dissertation „Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung“.⁴⁵ Er verweist noch auf andere Texte sowohl bei Josephus als auch bei anderen Schriftstellern, die er indes weder im Wortlaut zitiert noch bespricht. Die Frage ist damit jedoch in einen weiteren Rahmen gestellt; vielleicht gelingt es jetzt, die gesuchte Antwort zu finden.

Haben wir es also mit einer Wendung zu tun, die zu den *Topoi* gerechnet werden kann, d. h. einer rhetorischen Wendung, die nun einmal zur Theorie der Geschichtsschreibung gehört⁴⁶ und folglich nicht viel zu bedeuten hat? Seitdem ich 1949 meinen Aufsatz „De la règle Μῆτε προσθεῖναι μήτε ἀφελεῖν dans l'histoire du canon“⁴⁷ veröffentlichte, in dem ich auch Josephus kurz erwähnte, hat mich immer wieder die Frage beschäftigt, wie es sich in dieser Hinsicht eigentlich mit dem jüdischen Historiker verhält. Leider scheint dieser Artikel den Gelehrten, deren Meinungen oben angeführt sind, unbekannt geblieben zu sein. Das wäre sicher nicht weiter schlimm, hätte man nur die Texte, die ich auf den Tisch gelegt habe, in Betracht gezogen; aber das ist leider nicht der Fall, und so sind ihre Ausführungen eben unvollständig und können nicht zu einem gesicherten Urteil führen.

In seinem ausgezeichneten Werk „Die literarische Fälschung im Altertum“⁴⁸ hat Wolfgang Speyer diesem Material wohl Rechnung getragen und es durch eine Anzahl von Stellen aus späterer Zeit sogar noch vermehrt. Er schreibt zur Sache wie folgt: „Die Wahrheitsbeteuerung gehört zur ‚Exordialtopik‘ der Geschichtsschreiber. Diese benutzen dabei häufig die formelhafte Wendung, nichts hinzufügen und nichts wegnehmen zu wollen. Ein solches Versprechen beziehen sie teils allgemein auf die geschichtliche Wahrheit, teils auf die Wiedergabe schriftlicher Vorlagen.“⁴⁹

Beim ersten Zuhören scheint das ausgezeichnet zu dem Josephus-Text, von dem wir ausgegangen sind, zu passen. Bei näherem Zusehen melden sich jedoch Bedenken. Erstens: Kann man wirklich sagen, daß dieser Ausdruck zu einer „Exordialtopik“ gehört? Vielleicht ist das richtig für die von Speyer

45 G. Avenarius. *a.a.O.*, S. 45: „Weder darf et den Ereignissen etwas hinzufügen, was über das wirklich Geschehene hinausgeht, noch etwas weglassen, was für eine richtige Beurteilung von Bedeutung ist.“

46 Vgl. über die *loci communes* die Handbücher der Rhetorik.

47 W.C. van Unnik, *De la règle Μῆτε προσθεῖναι μήτε ἀφελεῖν dans l'histoire du canon*, in: *Vigiliae Christianae* III (1949), pp. 1–36.

48 W. Speyer. *Die literarische Fälschung im Altertum*, München 1971. S. 60–62.

49 W. Speyer. *a.a.O.*, S. 60.

berücksichtigte Literatur, aber bestimmt nicht für die hellenistische Zeit. Soweit uns die Proömien bekannt sind, ist Josephus der einzige Autor, der diese Wortverbindung im Proömium verwendet, und wo sie, wie wir noch sehen werden, bei anderen Schriftstellern vorkommt, steht sie nicht an dieser Stelle. Zweitens: Man spricht m. E. oft zu leichthin von einem *Topos*, der sich dann doch als nicht viel mehr erweist als ein Gemeinplatz. Natürlich läßt sich nicht leugnen, daß die rhetorische Bildung im Altertum den Schriftstellern bestimmte Gedanken in festen Formeln an die Hand gab, und der heutige Leser sollte damit immer rechnen. Aber viel bedeutender als eine Formel ist ihre Verwendung. Man kann nicht einfach, wie es z. B. Avenarius tut, unter Angabe einiger Stellen von einer „formelhaften Wendung“ reden. Man sollte diese Stellen aufschlagen, und man wird entdecken, daß der Kontext der Wendung jeweils eine eigene Prägung aufprägt. Nicht die Formel an sich, sondern ihr Inhalt und ihre Verwendung sind bedeutungsvoll und ausschlaggebend.

Deshalb wenden wir uns jetzt den Texten selbst zu. Weil Josephus noch an einigen anderen als den oben erwähnten Stellen die Verbindung gebraucht, hat er den Vorrang.

A

1) An einer Stelle seiner *Antiquitates* hat Josephus ausdrücklich auf sein Proömium zurückverwiesen, nämlich X 218. Nachdem er die zweite Traumdeutung in Dan. 4 und des Königs Nebukadnezar Krankheit und Genesung erzählt hat, bemerkt er plötzlich, niemand möge ihm Beschwerde machen, wenn er das alles in seiner Schrift berichte, so wie er es in den alten Büchern gefunden habe; „denn gleich am Anfang meiner Geschichte habe ich mich gegen Leute abgesichert, die mehr über die Dinge wissen möchten oder etwas daran aussetzen haben, indem ich sagte, ich würde nur die Bücher der Hebräer in griechischer Sprache wiedergeben (μεταφράζειν), und versprach, eben das, was darin steht, zur Kenntnis zu bringen, ohne selbst etwas Eigenes dem hinzuzufügen oder etwas davon fortzunehmen (καὶ ταῦτα δηλώσειν μῆτε προστιθεὶς τι τοῖς πράγμασιν αὐτὸς ἴδιον μὴτ' ἀφαιρῶν ὑπεσχημένος)“.

Weshalb Josephus das Versprechen seines Vorwortes hier in Erinnerung ruft, ist nicht klar. Er tut es etwa in der Mitte seiner Arbeit. Geschieht es mit einer bestimmten Absicht? Waren etwa die Prophetien des Daniel Gegenstand von Kontroversen, und spielten sie eine bestimmte Rolle in Debatten (s. unten S. 52)? Josephus hätte die gleiche Bemerkung auch an anderen Stellen machen können. Nun, er hat einen großen Teil seiner Aufgabe erledigt, und jetzt wiederholt er sein Versprechen. Das kann doch nur bedeuten, daß er sein Versprechen am Anfang nicht leichthin hingeworfen hat, weil das so durch das Handbuch der Rhetorik vorgeschrieben war. Er ist sich dessen bewußt,

was er getan hat, und erklärt vor aller Welt nun, daß er seinem Programm und seinem Versprechen treu geblieben ist. Er hat, bevor er dies erklärt, das, was im 4. Kapitel des Danielbuches ausführlich (37 Verse) beschrieben wird, kurz den Tatsachen nach wiedergegeben, wobei das Licht mehr auf die Weisheit des Propheten fällt als auf den Wahnsinn des babylonischen Königs. Auch in diesem kurzen, faktischen Bericht ist er seinem Programm treu. Was besagt das? Josephus gibt uns die Antwort hier nicht. Sie werden wir indes, glaube ich, später finden, wenn wir bei Dionysius von Halicarnassus in die Schule gehen. Jedenfalls ist uns dieser Text des Josephus aber behilflich gewesen, die Fragestellung zu präzisieren.

2) Relevant für unser Thema ist auch die Erklärung in *Ant. Jud.* IV 196 f. Hier sagt Josephus bei der Besprechung der mosaischen Staatsverfassung, daß „alles aufgezeichnet worden ist, was jener hinterlassen hat, während wir nichts zur Verschönerung hinzugefügt haben, auch nichts, was Moses nicht hinterlassen hat“. Die einzige Neuerung, die Josephus vorgenommen hat, ist, daß er das Material nach sachlichen Gesichtspunkten geordnet hat und es nicht so zerstreut darbietet, wie es von Mose aufgezeichnet wurde. Er sagt dies, um sich gegen Kritik und Aburteil seiner Volksgenossen zu wehren, die seine Bücher lesen.⁵⁰ Diese Mitteilung ist überraschend und interessant. Josephus ist sich danach bewußt, daß er Änderungen vornimmt, und deutet es selbst mit dem etwas belasteten Verbum *νεωτερίζειν*⁵¹ an. Er sagt auch deutlich, in welche Richtung ein eventuelles Hinzufügen gehen würde, nämlich in die der „Verschönerung“, und dies lehnt er ab. Merkwürdig ist, daß er nicht die vollständige Wendung gebraucht hat, die hier zur Erörterung steht. Aber wie sollte er, der den großen Gesetzgeber Mose so verehrt, so etwas überhaupt im Sinne gehabt haben? Das wäre doch wohl eine Absurdität! „Verschönerung“ kann er natürlich erwogen haben. Aber was bedeutet das? Ist das mit Hinsicht auf das Sprachmedium gesagt? Er hat doch die oft holprige Sprache der Septuaginta geändert. Wie ist es dann gemeint?

3) In der Einleitung zum *Bellum Judaicum* wird eine Art Inhaltsübersicht gegeben. Josephus kündigt an, er werde auch eine Beschreibung des Tempels und seines Rituals aufnehmen: „Dabei werde ich von den Ergebnissen meiner

50 Der Text lautet wie folgt: γέγραπται δὲ πάνθ' ὅσα ἐκεῖνος κατέλιπεν, οὐδὲν ἡμῶν ἐπὶ καλλωπισμῷ προσθέντων, οὐδ' ὃ τι μὴ καταλέλοιπε Μωσῆς. (197) νεωωτέριστα δ' ἡμῖν τὸ κατὰ γένος ἕκαστα τάξει· σποράδην γὰρ ὑπ' ἐκεῖνου κατελείφθη γραφέντα, καὶ ὡς ἕκαστόν τι παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ πύθοιτο, τούτου χάριν ἀναγκαῖον ἡγησάμην προδιαστείλασθαι, μὴ καὶ τις ἡμῖν παρὰ τῶν ὁμοφύλων ἐντυγχανόντων τῇ γραφῇ μέμψις ὡς δημαρτηκόσι γένηται.

51 Das Verbum *νεωτερίζειν* ist im Griechischen meistens soviel wie „eine Revolution machen“ und hat somit eine stark pejorative Bedeutung (s. Liddell-Scott. *Lc.*, p. 1172. s. v.).

Forschung weder etwas verheimlichen noch hinzufügen“ (Übersetzung von Michel-Bauernfeind; I 26: οὐδὲν οὔτε ἀποκρυπτόμενος οὔτε προστιθείς τοῖς πεφωραμένοις).

Die hier gebrauchte Formel ist nicht identisch mit der in anderen Fällen benutzten. Man darf wohl annehmen, daß hier „verheimlichen“ anstelle von „fortnehmen“ gebraucht ist, weil Josephus in diesem Zusammenhang nicht mit etwas Vorgegebenem, entweder seinen Quellen oder Tatsachen, arbeitet, sondern mit eigener Forschung, deren Resultate er ausdehnen oder verheimlichen könnte. In *Bell. Jud.* I 22 ist weiter die Inanspruchnahme von „nicht verbergen“ durch ihn ein Zeichen seiner Akribie,⁵² auf die er in seiner Vorrede ebensoviel Wert legt wie auf die „Wahrheit“, die herauszustellen der Zweck seiner Geschichte des jüdischen Krieges in der Abwehr falscher Darstellungen von Judenfeinden war.⁵³

4) Der Text *Ant. Jud.* XII 418 bringt die Wiedergabe eines Vertrags zwischen den Juden und den Römern. Darin erscheint die Klausel, daß, falls das jüdische Volk etwas hinzufügen oder wegzunehmen wünsche, dies in Übereinstimmung mit den Römern geschehen solle. Diesen Wortlaut hat Josephus seiner Vorlage 1. Makk. 8:30 entnommen.⁵⁴ Er ist also nur insofern charakteristisch für ihn, als er diese Ausdrucksweise übernehmen konnte und wollte. Auch dieser Text zeigt, daß Josephus mit einer schon bestehenden Formel bekannt ist. Hier gehört sie zu der Formelsprache der Staatsverträge, um den Text und dadurch den Vertrag selbst unversehrt zu erhalten. In meinem Aufsatz von 1949 habe ich darüber ausführlich gehandelt.⁵⁵

5) In *Contra Apionem* I 37 ff. spricht Josephus von den heiligen Schriften der Juden, die von Propheten aufgezeichnet sind und einander nicht widersprechen.⁵⁶ Die hohe Wertschätzung, in der sie von den Juden gehalten werden, zeige sich in der Tatsache, daß, „obwohl so lange Zeit vergangen ist (seitdem sie geschrieben wurden), niemand es gewagt hat, etwas hinzuzufügen oder wegzunehmen oder zu ändern“ (42: τοσούτου γὰρ αἰῶνος ἤδη παρῶχηκός οὔτε

52 Es heißt dort: καὶ τὰ περὶ ἐκάστην πόλιν τῶν ἀλισκομένων πάθῃ μετ' ἀκριβείας, ὡς εἶδον ἢ ἔπαθον, δίδειμι· οὐδὲ γὰρ τῶν ἑμαυτοῦ τι συμφορῶν ἀποκρύψομαι, μέλλων γε πρὸς εἰδότας ἔρεῖν.

53 Vgl. *Bell. Jud.* I 7–8.

54 Der Text in I, Makk. 8:30 lautet so: ἐὰν δὲ μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους βουλευσῶνται οὗτοι καὶ οὗτοι προσθεῖναι ἢ ἀφελεῖν, ποιήσονται ἐξ αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν, καὶ ὃ ἂν προσθῶσιν ἢ ἀφέλῳσιν, ἔσται κύρια.

55 Vgl. *Vig. Christ.* III (1949), S. 28–30.

56 Josephus, c. *Apionem* I 37: ἄτε μήτε τοῦ ὑπογράφειν αὐτεξουσίῳ πᾶσιν ὄντος μήτε τινὸς ἐν τοῖς γραφομένοις ἐνούσης διαφωνίας, ἀλλὰ μόνων τῶν προφητῶν τὰ μὲν ἀνωτάτω καὶ παλαιότατα κατὰ τὴν ἐπίπνοιαν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ μαθόντων, τὰ δὲ καθ' αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐγένετο σαφῶς συγγραφόντων.

προσθεῖναι τις οὐδὲν οὔτ' ἀφελεῖν αὐτῶν οὔτε μεταθεῖναι τετόλμηκεν). Hier wird von den hebräischen Schriften gesprochen, deren heiliger, göttlicher Charakter durch ihre Unversehrtheit gewährleistet ist; daran etwas zu ändern, wäre eine Tollkühnheit. Obwohl aus diesem und auch aus dem vorigen Text deutlich wird, in welcher Sphäre die Wortverbindung beheimatet sein könnte, stehen die Schriften, um die es sich hier handelt, doch auf einer anderen Stufe als die Werke des Josephus, so sehr er sich seiner Würde auch bewußt war. Deshalb müssen wir nun noch andere Historiker zum Vergleich heranziehen.

B

1) In seiner für die Theorie der Geschichtsschreibung in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit so bedeutsamen kritischen Beschäftigung mit Thucydides verwendet *Dionysius von Halicarnassus*—er lebte seit 30 v. Chr. in Rom—die besprochene Wortverbindung dreimal, und zwar in verschiedener Nuancierung.

a) In Kap. 5 heißt es, daß die Geschichtsschreiber, die vor Thucydides lebten, nur ein Ziel hatten, nämlich alle Erinnerungen bekanntzumachen „so wie sie diese empfangen hatten, ohne etwas hinzuzufügen oder von ihnen fortzunehmen“, wobei sie auch einige Mythen mit in Kauf nahmen.⁵⁷ Hier hat die Formel die Bedeutung festzustellen, daß diese Volksüberlieferungen ohne weiteres, unverändert und unkritisch, in die Geschichtswerke aufgenommen wurden. Der Vergleich mit Josephus ist interessant. Er nimmt ebenfalls unversehrt in seine *Archäologie* auf, was in den heiligen Schriften steht; aber er braucht nicht kritisch zu sein, weil im Buch des großen Gesetzgebers Mose keine Mythen stehen. Von hier empfängt die polemische Note, die in Josephus' Proömium zu vernehmen ist, eine scharfe Beleuchtung.

b) Nach Kap. 8 bezeugen die meisten Philosophen und Rhetoren, daß Thucydides sehr um die Wahrheit besorgt war („deren Priesterin die Geschichte sein soll“), sofern er den Tatsachen nichts hinzufügte—was nicht recht sei—noch etwas davon wegnahm und nicht nach eigener Willkür schrieb, sondern sein Vorhaben unbescholten durchführte und von jeder Schmeichelei, vor allem in seinen Urteilen über gute Männer,⁵⁸ freihielt.

57 Dionysius Hal., *De Thucydide* 5: ὅσαι διεσφύζοντο παρὰ τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις μνήμῃσι... ταύτας εἰς τὴν κοινὴν ἀπάντων γνώσιν ἐξενεγκεῖν, οἷας παρέλαβον μήτε προστιθέντες αὐταῖς τι μήτε ἀφαιροῦντες.

58 Dionysius Hal., *De Thuc.* 8: πλείστην ἐποίησατο πρόνοιαν, οὔτε προστιθεὶς τοῖς πράγμασιν οὐδὲν ὃ μὴ δίκαιον οὔτε ἀφαιρῶν... ἀνέγκλητον δὲ καὶ καθαρὰν τὴν προαίρεσιν ἀπὸ παντὸς φθόνου καὶ πάσης κολακείας φυλάττων.

Hier enthält die Wendung also ein Lob: Thucydides hat die Wahrheit hochgehalten, keinen Schwindel mit den Tatsachen getrieben und sein Urteil über Menschen nicht durch unedle Affekte verdorben. Wichtig ist hieran natürlich, daß dadurch die Wahrheit im objektiven und im subjektiven Sinn sicher ans Licht kommt.

c) In Kap. 16 bemerkt Dionysius, in dem ganzen Geschichtswerk des Thucydides finde man viele Beispiele für Stellen, die nur sehr oberflächlich nach den Forderungen der Rhetorik bearbeitet sind und „die keine Hinzufügung und auch keine Wegnahme empfangen haben“.⁵⁹ Was Dionysius hier meint, geht klar aus dem vorangehenden Kapitel hervor; denn dort wird Thucydides scharf kritisiert, weil er Unheil das eine Mal sehr übertrieben und pathetisch, das andere Mal knapp und dürftig beschrieben hat. Durch die Bearbeitung hätte er unter Fortnehmen und Hinzufügen solche Katastrophen in angemessener Weise schildern sollen. Hier enthält die Wendung also einen Tadel.⁶⁰

2) *Diodorus Siculus*, der in der Zeit von 60–30 v. Chr. seine *Weltgeschichte* schrieb, verwendet die Wendung nicht in seinem ausführlichen Proömium, wohl aber in seiner kritischen Besprechung des sizilianischen Historikers Timaeus (ca. 300 v. Chr.). Er sagt, daß Timaeus unerbittlich die Fehler seiner Vorgänger an den Pranger gestellt und sich selbst sehr um die Wahrheit bemüht, aber den Tyrann Agathocles,⁶¹ der ihn ins Exil geschickt hatte, durch seine Darstellung für alle Zeit verlästert habe; denn er habe vorangegangenen Bosheiten dieses Königs noch viele auf eigene Faust hinzugefügt, ihm seine Erfolge aber genommen und ihm zudem die Mißerfolge, die ihn durch das Schicksal trafen, auf das eigene Konto gesetzt, habe ihn auch feige genannt, während er doch tapfer war.⁶² Hier sieht man deutlich, was das „Hinzufügen

59 Dionysius Hal., *De Thuc.* 16: πολλά καὶ ἄλλα τις ἂν εὖροι δι' ὅλης τῆς ἱστορίας ἢ τῆς ἄκρας ἐξεργασίας τετυχηκότα καὶ μῆτε πρόσθεσιν δεχόμενα μῆτε ἀφαίρεσιν.

60 Dionysius Hal., *Antiq. Romanae* VI 95, 2 wird die Formel in Zusammenhang mit einem Vertrag genannt: ταῖς δὲ συνθήκαις ταύταις μηδὲν ἐξέστω προσθεῖναι μηδ' ἀφελεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ὅ τι ἂν μὴ Ῥωμαίοις τε καὶ Λατίνοις ἄπασι δοκῇ. Vgl. damit oben S. 36 und den Verweis auf meinen Artikel in *Vig. Chr.* III.

61 Vgl. Fr. Kiechle. *Agathokles*, in: K. Ziegler W. Sontheimer, *Der Kleine Pauly*, Bd. I. Stuttgart 1964, Sp. 118–119.—Über den Historiker Timaeus: G.L. Barber. *Timaeus* (2). in: N.G.L. Hammond – H.H. Scullard, *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*,² Oxford 1970, p. 1074.

62 Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica* XXI 17,2: καθόλου γὰρ ταῖς προϋπαρχούσαις τῷ βασιλεῖ τούτῳ κακίαις ἄλλα πολλά παρ' ἑαυτοῦ προσθεῖς ὁ συγγραφεύς, τὰς μὲν εὐημερίας ἀφαιρούμενος αὐτοῦ, τὰς δὲ ἀποτεύξεις, οὐ τὰς δι' αὐτὸν μόνον γενομένας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς διὰ τύχην μεταφέρων εἰς τὸν μηδὲν ἐξαμαρτόντα. Vgl. auch Diodorus' Urteil über Timaeus in *Hist.* XIII 90. 6: Τίμαιος ὁ τῶν πρό γε αὐτοῦ συγγραφέων πικρότατα κατηγορήσας καὶ συγγνώμην οὐδεμίαν τοῖς

oder Fortlassen“ bei einem Historiker bedeutete und in welche Richtung sich solches Verfahren auswirkte. Es liegt in der einen wie in der anderen Weise Verfälschung der Wahrheit vor. Ein Historiker, der so handelt, gibt ja den geschichtlichen Sachverhalt nicht genau wieder.

3) Auch *Lucian* nennt in seinem Traktat *De arte historiae conscribendae* 47 unsere Regel, wenn er davon spricht, wie der Historiker in der Phase der Geschichtsforschung, also noch nicht der Geschichtsschreibung, mit mühevollen Aufwand sein Material sammeln soll. Er soll die Tatsachen entweder aus eigener Anschauung oder mit Hilfe von Gewährsmännern zusammenbringen, „von denen anzunehmen ist, daß sie nicht, weder durch Zuneigung noch durch Feindschaft verleitet, irgendwelche Tatsachen verschweigen oder etwas hinzufügen.“⁶³ Die Anwendung dieser Regel garantiert die Zuverlässigkeit der Berichterstattung; mit ihrer Hilfe läßt sich entscheiden, von wem man Information übernehmen kann und wem nicht zu trauen ist. Auch wird hier klar ausgesprochen, welche guten oder schlechten Beweggründe zur Abweichung von dieser Regel führen könnten. Bei Diodorus Siculus (B 2) fand sich schon ein gutes Beispiel für die Feindschaft (ἀπέχθεια), bei Josephus für die Ausschmückung (καλλωπισμός, A 2) als Motiv. Es darf somit als gesichert gelten, daß auch *Lucian* hier eine Auffassung wiedergibt, die der hellenistischen Zeit angehört.⁶⁴

An diesem Punkt möchte ich die Übersicht über das Vorkommen der Formel bei den Historikern abschließen und die von Speyer gegebenen Beispiele beiseite lassen, weil sie aus viel späteren Zeiten stammen.

Aus den vorggeführten Texten geht m. E. folgendes Ergebnis deutlich hervor:

1. Die Formel „nicht hinzufügen oder fortnehmen“ gehörte nicht zur „Exordialtopik“, obwohl sie, wie Josephus zeigt, auch dort verwendet werden konnte.

ιστοριογράφοις ἀπολιπὼν αὐτὸς εὐρίσκεται σχεδιάζων, ἐν οἷς μάλιστα ἑαυτὸν ἀποπέφαγκεν ἀκριβολογούμενον. Polybius, *Hist.* XII 25 k spricht von des Timaeus ἐκούσιος ψευδογραφία.

63 Die Übersetzung nach H. Homeyer, *Lukian. Wie man Geschichte schreiben soll*. München 1965, S. 153. Der Text lautet: τὰ δὲ πράγματα αὐτὰ οὐχ ὡς ἔτυχε συνακτέον, ἀλλὰ φιλοπόνως καὶ ταλαιπώρως πολλάκις περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀνακρίναντα, καὶ μάλιστα μὲν παρόντα καὶ ἐφορῶντα, εἰ δὲ μή, τοῖς ἁδεκαστότερον ἐξηγουμένοις προσέχοντα καὶ οὐς εἰκάσειεν ἂν τις ἥκιστα πρὸς χάριν ἢ ἀπέχθειαν ἀφαιρήσειν ἢ προσθήσειν τοῖς γεγονόσι. Zu dem Gebrauch von „Zuneigung oder Feindschaft“ in diesem Zusammenhang s. G. Avenarius. *a.a.O.*, S. 49–54, und für Josephus oben S. 35.

64 J. Hohmeyer, *a.a.O.*, S. 45–60: Die hellenistischen Quellen.

2. Man kann nicht sagen, daß es sich nur um eine „formelhafte Wendung“ handelt; denn die Kontexte sind verschieden und weisen eine verschiedene Anwendung auf.
3. Die Wortverbindung hat in einem historiographischen Zusammenhang eine sehr präzise Bedeutung, sofern nämlich ein Autor durch Hinzufügen oder Fortlassen einen Tatbestand nicht richtig wiedergibt, sondern ihn aus parteiischen Gründen wesentlich ändert.

Durch Aristoteles (*Ethica Nicomachea* II 6,9; p. 1106) wissen wir, daß die Wortverbindung im Sinn einer Beteuerung allgemein gebräuchlich war, um anzugeben, daß eine Sache „gut“ war.⁶⁵ Durch ihre Betonung wurde, wie ich in meinem früher zitierten Aufsatz gezeigt habe, die Unversehrtheit einer tradierten Sache gewährleistet, die Genauigkeit des Überliefers gesichert.⁶⁶ Wenn man so vom Usus der Wendung „nichts hinzufügen, nichts fortnehmen“ her ihren Gebrauch bei Josephus in der Vorrede zu seinen *Antiquitates* liest, sieht man, daß die älteren Interpretationen dieses Textes, die wir uns vergegenwärtigt haben, nicht richtig sein können, weil sie diesen Usus nicht in Betracht gezogen haben und deshalb mit einem falschen Maßstab arbeiteten.

Josephus will eben in seinem Proömium nicht sagen, daß er nur sklavisch wiederholt, was im Alten Testament steht—dann hätte er seinen Lesern den Text der Bibel in die Hand geben können—, sondern daß er, was er in seiner Quelle fand, treu wiedergegeben hat, ohne aus Haß oder Schmeichelei etwas an der Sache zu ändern.⁶⁷ Deshalb versichert er seinen Lesern, sie würden über die Tatsachen genauen Bescheid erhalten. Das besagt also nicht, daß er nicht auch eigene Wiedergabe, Zusammenfassung, Beleuchtung in seinem Werk brächte, sondern nur, daß er mit der Wiedergabe seiner Quellen Anspruch auf Korrektheit und Richtigkeit erhebt. Er hat seiner eigenen Meinung nach die Geschichte seines Volkes wahrheitsgemäß dargestellt, und seine Leser konnten sich auf ihn verlassen.

Angesichts dessen ist das Ergebnis unserer Überlegungen von erheblicher Bedeutung für die Beurteilung des Josephus als Historiker und seines Werks als eines Dokuments der Geschichtsschreibung seiner Zeit. Sie ist begründet in der Art, wie er sich die Regel „nichts hinzufügen, nichts fortnehmen“ zur Richtschnur gemacht und sie in seiner schriftstellerischen Arbeit zur Anwendung gebracht hat.

65 Von mir behandelt in *Vig. Chr.* III, S. 27.

66 Vgl. *Vig. Chr.* III, S. 32 ff.

67 Das erinnert an die berühmte Wendung des Tacitus „sine ira et studio“ (*Annales* I 1).

III Die Prophetie bei Josephus⁶⁸

Jeder, der sich mit dem Leben des Josephus befaßt hat, kennt die Geschichte der großen Wendung, die sich in seinem Geschick vollzogen hat: wie der Priestersohn als Anführer der jüdischen Truppen in Galiläa gegen die Römer gekämpft hat, gefangen genommen wurde oder, richtiger, sich in die Hände der Feinde gab, von Vespasian verschont wurde und zu großer Ehre aufstieg. Im 8. Kapitel des dritten Buches seines *Bellum Judaicum* hat er die dramatischen Umstände, unter denen sich dieser Umschwung vollzog, beschrieben. Man kann sich vorstellen, daß er von seinen Landsleuten als Verräter ihrer heiligen Sache angesehen wurde—eine Art Quisling im Altertum. Josephus hat das gewußt und sich in der Apologie seines Verhaltens—denn so darf man das erwähnte Kapitel wohl nennen—gegen diesen Vorwurf unter Anrufung Gottes gewehrt: „Ich rufe dich zum Zeugen an, daß ich diesen Schritt nicht als Verräter, sondern als dein Diener tue“ (III 354).⁶⁹

Die Tatsachen, die dahin führten, sind bekannt. Die Festung Jotapata, die Josephus als Kommandant besetzt hielt, ist gefallen. Er und seine Männer haben sich, bei der Einnahme der Stadt entkommen, in einer Höhle des Gebirges verborgen. Aber Josephus, von den Römern gesucht, wird verraten. Zwei Tribune, von Vespasian geschickt, versuchen, ihn zur Ergebung zu bewegen. Nach einigem Schwanken will er diesen Schritt tun, aber seine Soldaten überhäufen ihn mit Scheltreden: „Liebst du das Leben so sehr, Josephus, daß du es über dich gewinnst, als Sklave das Licht der Sonne zu schauen? Wie schnell hast du doch dich selbst vergessen! Wie viele Menschen hast du überredet, für die Freiheit zu sterben! ... Aber wenn du auch über dem Waffenglück der Römer dich selbst vergessen hast, so müssen wir für den Ruhm der Väter sorgen. Wir leihen dir Arm und Schwert: stirbst du freiwillig, dann als Feldherr der Juden; stirbst du unfreiwillig, dann als Verräter!“ (III 357 ff.).

In seinen Bericht flicht Josephus hier eine lange Rede als Antwort ein, in der er—natürlich nachträglich—seine Auffassung rechtfertigt, daß Selbstmord dem Willen Gottes entgegen ist. Er legt dann seinen Kampfesgenossen einen

68 Für Josephus als Prophet, vgl. O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumran-Sekte*, Tübingen 1960, S. 105–108.—Es sei hier auch hingewiesen auf die Behandlung bei H. Lindner *a.a.O.*, (s. oben, S. 25 Anm. 23), vor allem auf die Kapitel III „Der Selbstbericht des Josephus in B2–4“ und Kapitel IV „Josephus und der Aufstieg Vespasians“, S. 49–94. Lindner behandelt die Sache in einem ganz anderen Zusammenhang und unter anderer Perspektive.

69 Übersetzung von O. Michel – O. Bauernfeind, *Flavius Josephus, DE BELLO JUDAICO. Der Jüdische Krieg*, Darmstadt 1959, Bd. 1.

Plan vor, der auch ausgeführt wird: sie sollen nicht sich selbst umbringen, sondern der Reihe nach jeder seinen Nachbarn nach Entscheidung des Loses. „Da geschah es, daß Josephus übrig blieb, zusammen mit einem anderen; man mag dabei von Zufall oder von Gottes Vorsehung reden“ (III 387 ff.). Es ist sehr wahrscheinlich, daß Josephus dem Zufall oder der Vorsehung eine kleine Hilfe geleistet hat.⁷⁰ Jedenfalls sterben diese beiden nicht, sondern werden Kriegsgefangene. Josephus wird zu Vespasian geführt und, obwohl seine Tötung von einigen verlangt wird, auf Fürsprache des Titus am Leben gelassen und in strenger Haft festgesetzt. In einer geheimen Unterredung hat er dann dem Vespasian die Kaiserwürde verheißen. Obwohl diese Voraussage verständlicherweise auf Zweifel stieß, hat sie sich später als richtig herausgestellt mit der Folge, daß Josephus sich später in der kaiserlichen Huld hat sonnen können.

Man darf wohl annehmen, daß Josephus diesen tiefeingreifenden Einschnitt seines Lebens im großen und ganzen richtig dargestellt hat; denn es gab, als er diese Geschichte veröffentlichte, noch viele Leute, die genau Bescheid wußten und etwaige Lügen hätten an den Pranger stellen können. In diesem Zusammenhang möchte ich auch nicht über seine Beweggründe sprechen und ihn weder als einen schlaun Verräter noch einmal postum verurteilen noch als Realpolitiker für seine weise Einsicht preisen, obwohl ein Zyniker sagen könnte: Hätte Josephus nicht diese verurteilenswerten Schritte getan, besäßen wir diese große Geschichtsdarstellung nicht und könnten auch heute nicht davon reden. In seiner Apologie seines Verhaltens hat Josephus selbst in eine ganz andere Richtung gewiesen: Er tat das alles nicht, weil er um seine Haut besorgt war, sondern unter göttlicher Inspiration — „nicht als Verräter, sondern als Diener (δῖάκονος) Gottes“, wie wir schon aus seinem Gebet hörten. Natürlich kann man eine solche Aussage als frommen Schwindel vom Tisch wischen und sie als einen Fall unter tausend und abertausend ansehen, in denen Gottes Name mißbraucht worden ist, weil er als Decke für allerhand Schlechtigkeit dienen mußte. Ist da bei Josephus durchsichtige Hypokrisie? Man sollte, um zu einem gerechten Urteil zu kommen, bedenken, daß es den Fakten nach erstens wohl unbestreitbar ist, daß Josephus dem Vespasian eine Prophezeiung gemacht hat, und zweitens, daß Juden und Römer in einer Welt lebten, in der die Divination als Tatsache akzeptiert wurde. Natürlich ist es möglich, daß Josephus klug genug war, seinen Gedanken die Form einer Prophetie zu geben; aber es scheint mir unmöglich zu sein anzunehmen, daß er die Vorgänge nur

70 Das hier vorliegende mathematische Problem wurde behandelt von D. Kuyper Fzn., *De manufacturierster en het negervraagstuk*, in: *Hermeneus. Tijdschrift voor de antieke cultuur* XLII (1970), blz. 38–40.

literarisch so dargestellt hat, wie sie im *Bellum Judaicum* erzählt sind; denn er stand ja unter der Kontrolle seiner Zeitgenossen. Jedenfalls war Josephus davon durchdrungen, in diesem Falle unter göttlicher Inspiration gehandelt zu haben. Damit aber stoßen wir auf ein für die Lebensgeschichte dieses Historikers interessantes Phänomen: er wünschte sich, als Prophet angesehen zu wissen.

An zwei Stellen dieses Abschnittes zeichnet Josephus sein eigenes Bild als das eines solchen, der mit Weissagungen vertraut ist. Er kennt also die Prophetie nicht als ein Outsider, sondern als ein persönliches Erlebnis.

An der ersten Stelle (*Bell. Jud.* III 351–352) erzählt Josephus, wie in seiner bedrängten Lage bei ihm die Erinnerung an nächtliche Träume aufstieg, „durch die ihm Gott die über die Juden hereinbrechenden Schicksalsschläge und das künftige Geschick der römischen Kaiser gezeigt hatte“ (ἀνάμνησις... τῶν διὰ νυκτὸς ὀνείρων..., δι' ᾧ ὁ θεὸς τὰς τε μελλούσας συμφορὰς αὐτῷ προσήμεινεν Ἰουδαίων καὶ τὰ περὶ τοῦς Ῥωμαίων βασιλεῖς ἐσόμενα).

An diesen Bericht fügt er dann in der dritten Person folgende Aussage über sich an: „Er war auch in bezug auf die Auslegung von Träumen imstande, den richtigen Sinn der durch die Gottheit zweideutig gesprochenen Worte zu treffen; in jedem Fall wußte er gründlich Bescheid über die Weissagungen der heiligen Schriften, da er doch selbst ein Priester und aus dem Geschlecht von Priestern war“ (ἦν δὲ καὶ περὶ κρίσεις ὀνείρων ἱκανὸς συμβαλεῖν τὰ ἀμφιβόλως ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ λεγόμενα: τῶν γε μὴν ἱερῶν βίβλων οὐκ ἡγνόει τὰς προφητείας ὡς ἂν αὐτὸς τ' ὢν ἱερεὺς καὶ ἱερέων ἔγγονος).⁷¹ Die hier von Josephus gebrauchten Ausdrücke sind *termini technici*: κρίσις ὀνείρων = Traumdeutung (bei Josephus auch in *Ant. Jud.* II 89 in der Joseph-Geschichte: Pharao bewundert Joseph wegen zweier Dinge, τῆς τε κρίσεως τοῦ ὀνείρατος καὶ τῆς συμβουλίας);⁷² für συμβάλλειν = den richtigen Sinn einer dunklen, zweideutigen Aussage treffen, habe ich das schon in einer früheren Untersuchung dargelegt.⁷³ Mit den zwei Wegen, auf denen Gott die Zukunft voraussagt, ist er ganz vertraut: Gott hat die Zukunft in der Vergangenheit durch die Schriften bekanntgegeben, die er von Haus aus und durch seinen Beruf kennt; in der Gegenwart tut er es durch dunkle Träume, die man zu deuten wissen muß. Hier ist er Kenner und Ausleger und nicht nur

71 Hier habe ich die Übersetzung von Michel-Bauernfeind leicht geändert.—Für Josephus als Priester vgl. S. 26 Anm. 2.

72 Liddell-Scott. *l.c.*, p. 997, s. v. κρίσις I 4., vgl. auch p. 996, s. v. κρίνω II 5 und p. 1231 ὀνειροκρισία u.s.w.; Daniel 2:36.45.

73 Das habe ich gezeigt in meinem Aufsatz: *Die rechte Bedeutung des Wortes treffen* Lukas 2, 19, in: *Verbum. Essays on some aspects of the religious function of words* (Festschrift für H.W. Obbink), Utrecht 1964. S. 129–147.

ein Organ der Prophetie. Angesichts dessen ist es bedeutungsvoll, daß er auf den eben angeführten Satz den weiteren folgen läßt: „Als er nun zu derselben Stunde durch diese in das Geheimnis Gottes eingeweiht war und die furchterregenden Bilder der erst kurz zurückliegenden Träume aus seinem Innern hervorholte, brachte er Gott insgeheim ein Gebet dar.“ Er gebraucht hier (III 353) die Worte ὧν (d. h. der Schriften) ἐνθους γενόμενος, wie er es *Ant. Jud.* VI 56 von Saul unter den Propheten (γενόμενος ἐνθους προφητεύσεις σὺν αὐτοῖς) und *Ant. Jud.* VI 76 auch von Saul (ἐνθους γενόμενος) als Wiedergabe der Aussage 1. Sam. 11:6 LXX (καὶ ἐφήλατο πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπὶ Σαουλ) tut, und deutet damit auf persönliche Inspiration hin.

Die zweite Stelle steht am Ende des Abschnitts, in dem von Josephus' erster Begegnung mit Vespasian die Rede ist (*Bell. Jud.* III 392 ff.): Er sei nicht „bloß ein Gefangener“, sondern „komme als Kündler großer Ereignisse“ (ἐγὼ δ' ἄγγελος ἦκω σοι μερίζων), „von Gott gesandt“ (ὑπὸ θεοῦ προπεμπόμενος) (III 400). So verspricht er Vespasian und Titus die Alleinherrschaft. Zuerst nimmt Vespasian ihm diese Weissagung nicht ab, weil er den Verdacht hat, Josephus möchte nur seinen Kopf retten. Aber allmählich ändern sich, auch von anderer Seite ange-regt, seine Gedanken.⁷⁴ Josephus kann berichten (ebd. 405): „Daß Josephus mit seinen Vorhersagen zuverlässig war, stellte sich für Vespasian auch in anderen Fällen heraus“ (ἀτρεκὴ δὲ τὸν Ἰώσηπον καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις κατελάμβανεν). Denn als ein Vertrauter Vespasians sich wunderte, daß Josephus, falls er ein Prophet wäre, nicht den Fall Jotapatas und seine eigene Gefangenschaft vorausgesagt hatte (προυμαντεύσατο),⁷⁵ stellte sich durch Nachfrage unter den Kriegsgefangenen heraus, daß er das tatsächlich getan hatte.⁷⁶ „Als Vespasian die Aussage als

74 Siehe „Zeichen“ in III 404 und vgl. Michel-Bauernfeind, *a.a.O.*, S. 461–462 Anm. 96; W. Weber, *Josephus und Vespasian. Untersuchungen zu dem Jüdischen Krieg des Flavius Josephus*, Stuttgart 1921, S. 41 ff.

75 Ein bekanntes Argument gegen die Divination. Vgl. die Hecataeus-Geschichte bei Josephus. c. *Apionem* I 201–204 mit den bedeutsamen Worten: πῶς . . . οὗτος (sc. der Vogel, der zur Vogelschau gebraucht wurde) τὴν αὐτοῦ σωτηρίαν οὐ προῖδὼν περὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας πορείας ἡμῖν ἄν τι ὑγίης ἀπήγγελλεν; dazu bemerkt TH. Reinach. *Flavius Josephus contre Apion*, Paris 1930. p. 39: „L'histoire de Mosollamos est la caricature d'un très vieux thème: déjà l'*Illiade* (B. 858) met en scène un *oiônistès* que son art ne prémunit pas contre les dangers de l'expédition où il trouva la mort.“—Interessant ist auch die Geschichte von einem „Chaldäer“-Wahrsager bei Apuleius. *Metamorph.* II 12–14 (vgl. dazu J. Reiling, *Hermas and Christian Prophecy. A Study of the Eleventh Mandate*, Leiden 1973. p. 84). Siehe noch die Kritik von Ennius bei Cicero, *De Divinatione* I 132, mit der Anmerkung von A.S. Pease, *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Divinatione*. Darmstadt 1963, p. 336 f.

76 Vgl. III 406–407: ὁ δὲ Ἰώσηπος καὶ τοῖς Ἰωταπατηνοῖς ὅτι μετὰ τεσσαρακοστὴν ἐβδόμην ἡμέραν ἀλώσονται προειπεῖν ἔφη, καὶ ὅτι πρὸς Ῥωμαίων αὐτὸς ζωγραφήσεται, ταῦτα παρὰ τῶν

wahr bestätigt fand, begann er, nunmehr immer stärker an die Wahrheit der Weissagungen, die ihn selbst betrafen, zu glauben“ (ebd. 408).

Dieser Geschichte sei folgender Bericht im 4. Buch des *Bellum Judaicum* (592 ff.) hinzugefügt: Als Vespasian zum Kaiser ausgerufen ist, ist er davon überzeugt, durch göttliche Fürsorge die Macht bekommen zu haben. Dazu heißt es: „Neben anderen Vorzeichen (σημεία)... erinnerte er sich auch an die Worte des Josephus, der es gewagt hatte, ihn noch zu Lebzeiten Neros als Kaiser anzusprechen“ (ebd. 623). „Dann sprach er von dessen Weissagungen, die er damals selbst als bloße, aus der Furcht geborene Erdichtung beargwöhnt habe, deren göttliche Herkunft nun aber von der Zeit und den Tatsachen ganz offen erwiesen worden sei (τάς μαντείας... ἀποδειχθῆναι δ' ὑπὸ τοῦ χρόνου καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων θείας [625]), und er nannte es „eine Schande, daß der Mann, der ihm die Kaiserwürde vorher angesagt hat (προθεσπίσαντα) und Organ der Stimme Gottes (διάκονον τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ φωνῆς) war, noch ein Gefangener ist“ (626). Josephus wurde dann ehrenvoll freigelassen und kam in den Ruf eines Mannes, der zuverlässig von der Zukunft künden kann (629: ἤδη καὶ περὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἀξιόπιστος ἦν).

Aus der Terminologie läßt sich einwandfrei erheben, daß hier von Josephus als einem Propheten gesprochen wird und nicht nur als von einem Deuter von Orakeln. Die Erfüllung seiner Weissagung bestätigt ihn deutlich als wahren Propheten.⁷⁷ Ob er überhaupt und gegebenenfalls welche Schrifttexte er verwendet hat, wird nicht klar, obschon er von seiner Inspiration durch Schriftworte spricht (*Bell. Jud.* III 353). Sueton und Tacitus berichten, daß Orakel im Umlauf waren, die voraussagten, daß der neue Herrscher aus dem Osten kommen würde. In *Bell. Jud.* VI 312 f. spricht Josephus von einer zweideutigen Weissagung, die von vielen mißverstanden, aber von ihm auf Vespasian gedeutet wurde.⁷⁸ Man könnte an den Bileam-Spruch (Num. 24:17) als Motiv denken; aber in Josephus' Wiedergabe der Bileam-Geschichte in der *Archäologie* (IV 102 ff.) wird darauf nicht angespielt, sondern gesagt, es sei noch nicht alles in Erfüllung gegangen. R. Meyer dachte an Dan. 7:13 f.,⁷⁹ an

αἰχμαλώτων κατ' ἰδίαν ὁ Οὐρσπασιανὸς ἐκλυθόμενος ὡς εὕρισκεν ἀληθῆ, οὕτω πιστεύειν περὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτὸν ἥρκετο.

77 Vgl. darüber die Bemerkungen von A.S. Pease, *l.c.*, p. 74. Bei Josephus vgl. u. a. *Ant. Ind.* X 268 und überhaupt die Darstellung des Propheten Daniel durch Josephus (s. darüber unten S. 52).

78 Siehe Michel-Bauernfeind, *a.a.O.*, Bd. II 2. Darmstadt 1969, S. 90–192 Anm. 149 und Exkurs XV.

79 R. Meyer, *Der Prophet aus Galiläa. Studie zum Jesusbild der drei ersten Evangelien*, Leipzig 1940, S. 52 ff.

ein Kapitel, das Josephus in seiner Archäologie auch nicht wiedergegeben hat. Jedenfalls ist klar, daß Josephus geweissagt hat und daß die später erfolgten Ereignisse seine Voraussage glänzend bestätigt haben. Nach dem Maßstab von Deut. 18:22 „wenn der Prophet im Namen des Herrn redet und es sich nicht erfüllt und nicht eintrifft, so ist das ein Wort, das der Herr nicht geredet hat“ ist Josephus ein wahrer Prophet.

Es ist jedoch merkwürdig, daß er, ausgesandt, um die Juden im belagerten Jerusalem zur Übergabe zu mahnen, nicht als Prophet auftritt, sondern sie aus Israels Geschichte belehrt und sie warnt und zur Bekehrung aufruft (*Bell. Jud.* V 362 ff.). Oder war die Situation so klar, daß keine Prophetie mehr erforderlich war, weil jedermann den Ablauf voraussehen konnte?

Im Blick auf das Selbstverständnis des Josephus, der seine Begabung zu prophetischen Aussagen so deutlich zur Schau trägt, ist auch sein Zeugnis in *Ant. Jud.* X 210 bemerkenswert. Nachdem er ausführlich die Geschichte in Dan. 2 mit der Erklärung von Nebukadnezars Traum entfaltet hat, bemerkt er: „Daniel sprach auch über den Stein deutlich zum König (Dan. 2:44); aber ich habe beschlossen, das nicht zu berichten, da ich verpflichtet bin, das Vergangene und Gewordene zu beschreiben, aber nicht die Zukunft“ (ἐμοὶ... οὐκ ἔδοξε τοῦθ' ἱστορεῖν, τὰ παρελθόντα καὶ τὰ γεγενημένα συγγράφειν, οὐ τὰ μέλλοντα ὀφείλοντι). „Wenn jedoch einer nach Genauigkeit strebt und nicht vor großer Mühe zurückschreckt, weil er ja auch in bezug auf unklare Sachen wissen will, was geschehen wird, dann soll er sich eifrigst bemühen, das Buch Daniels zu lesen“. Hier findet sich bei Josephus eine Variante zu einer dreiteiligen Formel, die ich seinerzeit in einem Artikel unter dem Titel: „A Formula describing Prophecy“⁸⁰ untersucht habe. Diese Formel, die wir in verschiedenem Wortlaut im Altertum finden, beschreibt in den drei Worten „was war, was ist, was sein wird“ das Geheimnis der Geschichte in ihrer Totalität, das unter göttlicher Inspiration vom Propheten durchschaut wird. Josephus kennt diese Formel, aber er lehnt es ab, als Historiker (συγγράφειν wird oft von der Geschichtsschreibung gebraucht)⁸¹ auch Prophet zu sein. Er tut das an einer

80 W.C. van Unnik. *A Formula describing Prophecy*, in: *New Testament Studies* IX (1963), pp. 86–94. Dort habe ich diesen Josephus-Text nicht behandelt. Vgl. auch Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* IV 303: Danach las er (nämlich Mose) ihnen ein Gedicht in Hexametern vor, das er in dem heiligen Buch (oder: in einem Buch, das im Tempel aufbewahrt wurde [so übersetzt H.St.J. Thackeray]) hinterlassen hat, πρόρρησιν περιέχουσιν τῶν ἐσομένων, καθ' ἣν γέγονε πάντα καὶ γίνεται, μηδὲν ἐκείνου διημαρτηκότος τῆς ἀληθείας, ferner *Ant. Jud.* XI 155: (durch die Vorlesung der Gesetzte) δίκαιοι μὲν πρὸς τὸ παρὸν καὶ τὸ μέλλον ἐδιδάσκον το εἶναι, περὶ δὲ τῶν παρωχημένων ἐδυσφόρου.

81 Liddell-Scott. *L.c.*, p. 166. s. v. συγγραφεὺς: „one who collects and writes down historic facts, historian... then, generally, prose-writer“.

markanten Stelle: er verbietet es sich, eine Deutung des „Steines“ bei Daniel zu geben, wahrscheinlich deshalb, weil damit ein Reich gemeint war, das alle anderen Reiche zermalmen wird und ewig bestehen werde.⁸² Solch ein Wort konnte ja zu unerwünschten Spekulationen Anlaß geben.

Josephus hat sich also zu den lebendigen Propheten seiner Zeit gerechnet. Dies hat Rudolf Meyer in seinem Buch „Der Prophet aus Galiläa. Studie zum Jesusbild der drei ersten Evangelien“ von 1940 richtig herausgestellt, wie schon vor ihm Wilhelm Weber u.a. darauf hingewiesen haben.⁸³ Doch schien es auch mir aus verschiedenen Gründen erwünscht, diese Seite der Person und der Arbeit des Josephus speziell zu beleuchten.

Ich habe nämlich den Eindruck, daß man diesem Selbstverständnis des jüdischen Historikers bisher nicht genügend Rechnung getragen hat. Es bleibt z. B. im Schatten, wenn Thackeray und Shutt über *The Man* sprechen.⁸⁴ Sicher steht dieser Aspekt in seinen Werken nicht im Vordergrund. Aber man darf auf Grund der Lebenserfahrung doch ruhig sagen, daß viele Leute dasjenige, was sie am tiefsten bewegt, nicht zur Schau tragen, und daß es doch in ihrer Arbeit vibriert. Zudem sind einige Aspekte dieses Prophetentums bisher auf der Seite geblieben, und es war mir wichtig, vor allem das Vokabular gut ins Auge zu fassen. Und schließlich: Es sollte nun klar sein, daß wir, wenn wir über Prophetie bei Josephus sprechen, über eine Sache reden, die Josephus nicht nur objektiv, historisch, sondern auch subjektiv und ganz persönlich aufs stärkste interessiert hat. Diese Feststellung ist von höchster Bedeutung für die richtige Einschätzung der *Antiquitates*; denn dort spielt die Prophetie eine überaus beachtliche Rolle, und deshalb hat dies Buch nicht nur apologetisch und historisch seinen Wert, sondern auch theologisch.

In seiner soeben genannten Studie hat Rudolf Meyer auch dem „Prophetentum in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit“ ein Kapitel gewidmet.⁸⁵ Jeder Leser, der das von ihm hier und anderorts zusammengestellte Material⁸⁶ überblickt, wird seiner These zustimmen: „Der Prophetismus in seinen mannigfachen Erscheinungsformen ist für das Judentum der letzten vorchristlichen

82 R. Harris, *Testimonies* I, Cambridge 1916, p. 28 ss.: der Messias als Stein—J. Jeremias, λίθος, in: G. Kittel, *Theol. Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Bd. IV, Stuttgart 1942, S. 279 f.

83 R. Meyer, *a.a.O.*, S. 55 f.; W. Weber, *a.a.O.*, S. 43 f.

84 H.St. Thackeray, *Josephus. The Man and the Historian*, New York 1929. Lecture I: *Life and Character of Josephus*; R.J.H. Shutt, *Studies in Josephus*, London 1961, ch. 7: *Josephus. The Man and the Historian*.

85 R. Meyer, *a.a.O.*, S. 41 ff.

86 Vgl. auch R. Meyer, προφήτης, in: Kittel-Friedrich, *Theol. Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Bd. VI, Stuttgart 1959, S. 813–828.

und der ersten beiden nachchristlichen Jahrhunderte keineswegs allein eine Angelegenheit der klassischen Zeit, sondern er hat seine Bedeutung für das Leben der Gegenwart.“⁸⁷

Ich setze also als bekannt voraus, daß unter den Juden im Zeitalter kurz vor und nach der Zeitenwende Propheten in allerlei Formen auftraten. Im Gegensatz zu dem bekannten rabbinischen Dictum, seit Haggai, Sacharja und Maleachi, die als letzte Propheten gestorben sind, sei der Heilige Geist von Israel gewichen,⁸⁸ ist Josephus, wie wir sahen, der Meinung, daß die Prophetie bis auf seine Zeit besteht. Aber nun stellt sich die Frage, wie sich diese Sachlage zu der Aussage verhält, die Josephus in *Contra Apionem* I 40 macht. Denn nach ihr liegt im Zeitalter des Artaxerxes eine Zäsur, und es scheint, als sei—in Übereinstimmung mit dem eben angeführten Satz der Rabbinen—zu jener Zeit das Ende der Prophetie gekommen. Bei genauerem Zusehen löst sich diese Frage indes ganz einfach, und zwar in dem Sinne, daß kein Widerspruch vorliegt und daß die Bedeutung der Prophetie in der Zeit nach Artaxerxes unversehrt bleibt. Das ist eine Einsicht, die auch für die neutestamentliche Exegese sehr wichtig ist.

Die hier gemeinte Aussage des Josephus ist wohlbekannt, da sie in seinem berühmten Zeugnis über die jüdischen heiligen Schriften zu finden ist. Meistens wird sie nur in bezug auf Umfang und Einteilung des Kanons herangezogen. Nun sind das bestimmt wichtige Gesichtspunkte; aber Josephus' Anliegen war es nicht, davon zu sprechen. Im Rahmen seines Altersbeweises möchte er vielmehr zeigen, daß die jüdischen heiligen Schriften im Gegensatz zu den historischen Darstellungen der Griechen absolut zuverlässig sind. Sie sind von den Priestern in ununterbrochener Generationsfolge unversehrt bewahrt und waren zudem nicht von Privatpersonen, sondern ohne Ausnahme von Propheten geschrieben worden (I 37). „Nach dem Lebensende Moses“—der auch von Josephus als Prophet betrachtet wird⁸⁹—„bis auf Artaxerxes... haben die Propheten nach Mose die Geschichte ihrer Zeit in dreizehn Büchern dargestellt“ (I 40). Josephus faßt also die historischen Bücher (Josua u.s.w.) mit den prophetischen (Jesaja u.s.w.) unter dem einen Nenner „Propheten“ zusammen, wie es noch immer in der jüdischen Tradition der Fall ist. Dann folgert er: „Seit Artaxerxes bis auf unsere Zeit ist alles wohl schriftlich

87 R. Meyer, *Prophet*, S. 41.

88 Die Texte bei H.L. Strack—P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Bd. I. München 1922, S. 126. Anm. b.

89 Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* IV 320: Μωυσέως... μετ' εὐλογίας ἐκάστη τῶν φυλῶν προφητεύσαντος τὰ γενησόμενα.—IV 329: προφήτης δ' οἷος οὐκ ἄλλος, ὥσθ' ὃ τι ἂν φθέγγαιτο δοκεῖν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ἀκροᾶσθαι τοῦ θεοῦ.—V 20: τοῦ προφήτου κελεύσαντος an Josua.

festgelegt, verdient aber nicht dieselbe Wertschätzung wie das Frühere, weil keine genaue Sukzession der Propheten zustande kam“ (I 41). Hier wird also nicht gesagt, daß mit der Zeit des Artaxerxes der Prophetie an sich ein Ende gesetzt wurde und daß sie seitdem nicht mehr bestand. Nein, die Prophetie besteht noch;⁹⁰ nur gibt es keine genaue Sukzession (ἀκριβής διαδοχή) mehr. Da steckt der Unterschied! Das Wort διαδοχή ist in diesem Zusammenhang entscheidend. Es wird in der zeitgenössischen Literatur u. a. für die ununterbrochene Lehrtradition in Verbindung mit Philosophenschulen gebraucht⁹¹ und garantiert die Zuverlässigkeit der Lehre. Diese war nach der Meinung des Josephus, obwohl er das nicht ausdrücklich sagt, zwischen den Tagen des Mose und Artaxerxes gegeben. Obwohl er auch das nicht ausführt, darf man wohl annehmen, daß Josephus die Nachfolge von Mose durch Josua und von Elia durch Elisa verallgemeinert und auf die ganze Zeit ausgedehnt hat. Aber solch eine Linie kann er seitdem nicht mehr nachweisen. Das bedeutet nicht, daß das Phänomen der Prophetie nun verschwunden ist, sondern nur, daß zwischen den spontan auftretenden Propheten keine direkte Relation mehr besteht, und damit fehlt den im jüdischen Volk nach Artaxerxes entstandenen Schriften die Garantie.

Für den heutigen Zweck genügt es zunächst festzustellen, daß Josephus hier nicht das Vorhandensein von Propheten in Israel in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit leugnet, sondern es implizit anerkennt. Zweitens ist hier zu sehen, daß der spätere Prophetismus für Josephus auf einer Linie mit dem alttestamentlichen steht und nur des Zusammenhangs der Sukzession entbehrt. Drittens zeigt sich, wie groß für Josephus die Bedeutung der alttestamentlichen Prophetie war: die Geschichte, wie sie im Kanon dargestellt ist, enthält die volle Wahrheit, weil sie von Propheten und nicht von irgendwelchen Privatpersonen niedergeschrieben wurde.

Im Anschluß an diesen letzten Punkt muß nun darauf hingewiesen werden, daß die Propheten einen breiten Raum in der *Archäologie* einnehmen. Es würde sich lohnen, vor allem ihren ersten Teil unter diesem Gesichtspunkt genau zu untersuchen. Leider reicht die zur Verfügung stehende Zeit dazu

90 Es ist sehr bezeichnend, daß Josephus in seiner Wiedergabe des 1. Makkabäerbuches in *Ant. Jud.* die drei berühmten Stellen über die Abwesenheit der Propheten (1. Makk. 4:46; 9:27; 14:41) nicht aufgenommen hat. Der Text 1. Makk. 9:27 (καὶ ἐγένετο θλίψις μεγάλη ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, ἥτις οὐκ ἐγένετο ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας οὐκ ὤφθη προφήτης αὐτοῖς) wird so geändert: ταύτης δὲ τῆς συμφορᾶς τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τηλικαύτης γενομένης ἡλίχης οὐκ ἦσαν πεπειραμένοι μετὰ τὴν ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος ἐπάνοδον (*Ant. Jud.* XIII 5).

91 C.H. Turner, *Note on 'Succession' Language in non-Christian Sources*, in: H.B. Swete (ed.), *Essays on the early History of the Church and the Sacraments*, London 1918, pp. 197–199.

nicht aus; das Thema ist so stoffreich, daß es besser für eine zukünftige Monographie reserviert bleiben mag. In der Darstellung der jüdischen Religion nach der Beschreibung des Josephus gebührt in jedem Fall dem Prophetismus weit mehr Aufmerksamkeit, als ihm Schlatter und Fascher haben angedeihen lassen. Heute muß ich es allerdings dabei bewenden lassen, an einigen ausgewählten Punkten die Bedeutung der alttestamentlichen Prophetie für Josephus aufzuzeigen.

Josephus hat als Historiker dem Leben und den Worten der Propheten kein eigenes Buch gewidmet, sondern ihr Auftreten im Zusammenhang mit dem Geschichtsverlauf beschrieben, wie er in den Königsbüchern geschildert wird. Dabei hat er zuweilen etwas hinzugefügt. Das ist z. B. in *Ant. Jud.* X 38 f. der Fall. Dort sagt er über den gottlosen Manasse etwas, das nicht im Alten Testament steht, nämlich, daß dieser auch die Propheten nicht schonte, sondern einige von ihnen hinschlachtete und daß dann Gott Propheten sandte, um König und Volk mit Strafen zu bedrohen, die Israel treffen sollten, weil es sich gegen Gott gekehrt hatte. Dieser Passus wird mit folgenden Worten abgeschlossen: „Aber sie schenkten diesen Worten, durch welche sie den Gewinn hätten ziehen können, nichts Übles zu erfahren, keinen Glauben, sondern erst durch die Tatsachen lernten sie, daß wahr ist, was von den Propheten gesagt wird.“ Auch hat Josephus im 9. und im 10. Buch seiner *Archäologie* bestimmte Geschichten aus dem 2. Buch der Chronik mit solchen aus dem 2. Buch der Könige verbunden, und zwar vor allem solche, die die Rolle der Propheten beleuchten, wie z. B. den Bericht über Oded in *Ant. Jud.* IX 248 ff. Das zeigt, wie sehr er die Bedeutung der Propheten in Israels Königszeit ins Licht rücken möchte. Das wird auch sehr klar in der Lebensgeschichte Hiskias dort, wo der Bericht über seine Passafeier mitgeteilt wird (2. Chron. 30:1 ff.). Zu der Angabe des Alten Testaments, daß Hiskia Boten nach Israel sendet, um zur Mitfeier einzuladen, die dann verspottet werden, fügt Josephus noch hinzu (*Ant. Jud.* IX 265 ff.): „... die Propheten, die sie in der gleichen Weise ermahnten und voraussagten, was sie leiden würden, wenn sie sich nicht zur wahren Gottesverehrung bekehrten, spieen sie an, nahmen sie schließlich gefangen und töteten sie ... Aber viele aus dem Stamm Manasse und aus Zebulon und Isaschar gehorchten den Ermahnungen der Propheten und bekehrten sich zur wahren Gottesverehrung.“ Auch hier läßt Josephus Propheten mahnend und drohend zur Bekehrung aufrufen. In seiner Wiedergabe der Geschichte Israels und Judas ist überhaupt das Hauptthema die Frage, ob das Volk und vor allem der König den traditionellen Lebensstil, „die vorväterlichen Sitten“, d. h. die Gesetze Moses, in Frömmigkeit und Gerechtigkeit aufrechterhalten oder zu ihren Übertretern werden.

Immer wieder stehen dabei Propheten auf, um „vorherzusagen, was geschehen wird“ (προλέγοντες τὰ μέλλοντα), nämlich einen unglücklichen Zeitablauf, wenn das Volk in der Sünde beharrt. Die meisten Propheten sind bei Josephus als Unglücksansager gezeichnet. Das wird vor allem in einer merkwürdigen Äußerung über Daniel deutlich ausgesprochen (*Ant. Jud.* X 268): „Während die Propheten eine schlechtere Zukunft voraussagten und deshalb von den Königen und dem Volk gehaßt wurden, wurde Daniel für sie ein Prophet des Guten, so daß er sich wegen des schönen Inhalts der Weissagungen Wohlwollen von allen gewann und wegen ihrer Erfüllung Glauben an ihre Wahrheit und zugleich göttliches Ansehen bei der großen Masse des Volkes erwarb.“ Daniel ist also nach der Meinung des Josephus eine Ausnahme. Der entscheidende Unterschied zwischen ihm und den anderen Propheten liegt in der Voraussage von Unheil oder Heil. Die Mehrheit der Propheten hat Unheil verkündigt.

Das Eigentümliche dieser Auffassung wird auch durch die Geschichtsdarstellung des Josephus bestätigt. Er hat wohl die Propheten an geeigneter Stelle erwähnt, aber nur in ihrem Verhältnis zu den Königen. Daß es in der prophetischen Literatur neben Drohungen auch Aussicht auf eine herrliche Zukunft gibt, wird durch Josephus niemals gesagt. Er ist anscheinend weder an den Propheten als Personen noch an ihren Schriften interessiert; die eindrucksvolle Berufung Jesajas oder die Eingangsvision Hesekiels werden z. B. ebensowenig erwähnt wie die messianischen Verheißungen oder die Trostworte im zweiten Teil des Jesajabuchs. Aus Jesaja wird nur der Inhalt der Kapitel 36–39 breit wiedergegeben, der sich aber, wie bekannt, auch im 2. Buch der Könige findet. Der König Hiskia wird zwar vom Propheten ermutigt, doch wird ihm schließlich auch die Unterjochung unter Babylon angesagt. Obwohl Josephus in bezug auf die zwölf Propheten schreibt: „Alles was bei uns geschieht, sei es Gutes, sei es Schlechtes, hat seinen Ablauf in Übereinstimmung mit ihrer Prophetie“ (*Ant. Jud.* X 35), und obwohl er damit die Sache in der Schwebe hält, liegt bei ihm doch der Akzent deutlich auf dem üblen Geschick, das dem Volke bevorsteht.

Wie sehr Josephus alles auf den drohenden Untergang des Volkes zuspitzt, ergibt sich weiter aus seiner Wiedergabe der Geschichte der Abgesandten des Königs Josia. Im Alten Testament (2. Kön. 22:15 ff. = 2. Chron. 34:23 ff.) wird erzählt, die Prophetin Hulda habe verkündigt, das Volk werde Unheil treffen, der König aber werde es, weil er sich vor Gott gedemütigt habe, nicht mit ansehen müssen; dabei liegt das Gewicht ganz bei dem tröstlichen Zuspruch für den König. Bei Josephus ist das verschoben; was dem Fürsten widerfahren wird, ist nur nebenbei in einem Zwischensatz bemerkt, um festzustellen, daß das angesagte Unheil zwar aufgeschoben, aber nicht aufgehoben wird. Der Text liest sich so: „Die Prophetin . . . befahl den Gesandten, dem König zu

sagen, daß Gott bereits einen Beschluß gegen sie gefaßt habe, den niemand durch Flehen außer Kraft setzen könne, nämlich das Volk zu verderben, es aus dem Lande zu vertreiben und es aller seiner jetzigen Güter zu berauben, weil sie die Gesetze übertreten und sich in so langer Zwischenzeit nicht bekehrt hätten, während doch die Propheten sie ermahnt hätten, sich zu besinnen und die Strafe für ihre gottlosen Taten vorausgesagt hätten; diese Strafe werde er bestimmt über sie bringen, damit sie einsähen, daß er Gott sei und daß er nichts gelogen habe von dem, was er durch die Propheten ihnen verkündigt habe; seinetwegen (d. h. des Königs wegen) jedoch, der gerecht wäre, werde er das Elend noch aufschieben, nach seinem Tode aber die beschlossenen Leiden über das Volk bringen“ (*Ant. Jud.* X 60 f.).

Was Josephus über Daniel, den er natürlich in die Zeit des babylonischen Exils datiert, gesagt hat, ist eine Rückschau auf die vorausgegangene Periode, die zu der Katastrophe der Einnahme Jerusalems durch Nebukadnezar geführt hat. Für die Zeit der Restauration nach dem Exil erwähnt er wohl Haggai und Sacharja, die das Volk in der Notzeit während des Wiederaufbaus des Tempels ermunterten, auf die Unterstützung der Perser zu vertrauen (*Ant. Jud.* XI 106); aber das tut er nur ganz beiläufig. Eben dies scheint mir kein Zufall zu sein. Für Josephus sind die Propheten primär und fast ausschließlich Unheilsverkündiger. Er hat in seiner Geschichte denn auch den Untergang Jerusalems mehr ins Licht gestellt als die Restauration der Stadt.

Es ist überhaupt sehr interessant zu sehen, wie Josephus die Schriftprophetie behandelt hat. Natürlich sollte in einer vollständigen Besprechung des Themas „Prophetie bei Josephus“ auch von den anderen Propheten wie Samuel, Elia und Elisa die Rede sein. Für heute kann dies indes beiseite bleiben; denn hierin folgt unser Historiker mehr oder weniger getreu der biblischen Geschichte. Bei den Schriftpropheten liegt die Sache anders, weil er hier, wie gesagt, bestimmte Stücke aus den prophetischen Büchern in die Erzählung der Königsbücher eingeflochten hat. Dabei wird durch die Auswahl die Absicht deutlich.

Von dem Zwölf-Prophetenbuch dessen er, wie wir sahen, Erwähnung tut, nennt Josephus neben den schon angeführten Haggai und Sacharja ausdrücklich nur noch Jona und Nahum.⁹² Über Jona gab es eine sehr interessante Geschichte zu erzählen; denn er hat, wie Nahum, den Fall Ninives vorausgesagt (*Ant. Jud.* IX 205 ff., vor allem 214, neben IX 239 ff. mit Zitaten). Merkwürdigerweise erklärt Josephus, er führe nicht mehr an, um seine Leser nicht zu langweilen; er bemerkt lediglich, daß sich alles nach 115 Jahren erfüllt hat (IX 242). Es dürfte doch sehr bezeichnend sein, wie eben diese Propheten berücksichtigt sind. Von Jesaja war schon die Rede; nur sein Verhältnis zu

92 Micha wird nebenbei erwähnt, *Ant. Jud.* X 92: ... ἄλλα καὶ Μιχαῖαν πρὸ αὐτοῦ (sc. Jeremia) ταῦτα (sc. das Geschick Jerusalems) καταγγελέναι καὶ πολλοὺς ἄλλους.

Hiskia kommt zur Sprache. Hesekiel bleibt zwar nicht unerwähnt; denn es wird erzählt, daß er als junger Mann nach Babylon fortgeführt wurde (X 98), und weiterhin tritt er in Verbindung mit Jeremia in einem für das Verständnis der Prophetie sehr bedeutsamen Zusammenhang (X 104 ff.)⁹³ auf. Aber Jesaja und Hesekiel stehen doch gegenüber Jeremia und Daniel deutlich im Schatten. Diese beiden werden sehr ausführlich behandelt; sie treten bei Josephus ins volle Licht und sind zweifellos für ihn die Propheten *par excellence*.

Die Tatsache, daß Daniel einen so breiten Raum in der *Archäologie* einnimmt, könnte man durch den ziemlich starken Erzählungscharakter dieses Buches geneigt sein zu erklären, der sich gut mit seinem Wesen verträgt. Aber eine solche Erklärung reicht nicht aus. Für Josephus hat Daniel weit größere Bedeutung, nämlich eine direkte Gegenwartsbedeutung. Dieser Gottesmann stand ja in einem Konkurrenzkampf mit den babylonischen Wahrsagern und war ihnen eindeutig überlegen. Wenn man bedenkt, daß in den Tagen des Josephus die orientalischere Zukunftsschau im römischen Reich blühte, wird verständlich, wie stolz Josephus von dieser Figur der jüdischen Geschichte sprechen konnte. Daniels Prophetie war, wie wir schon früher bemerkten,⁹⁴ in der 2. Hälfte des 1. Jahrhunderts höchst aktuell, und auch Josephus weiß um ihre geheimnisvolle Kraft. Sprach dieser Prophet doch von kommenden großen Umwälzungen und Verschiebungen der Regimente. Vor allem wird von unserem Autor klar ausgesprochen, worin seine hohe Bedeutung liegt, wenn er in Anknüpfung an Dan. 8 schreibt (*Ant. Jud.* X 276 ff.): „Und es geschah, daß unserem Volke dies widerfuhr unter Antiochus Epiphanes, wie Daniel es gesehen und viele Jahre vorher die Zukunft beschrieben hat. In derselben Weise hat Daniel auch über die Herrschaft der Römer geschrieben und daß durch sie Jerusalem erobert und der Tempel verödet werden sollte. Das alles hat er, weil Gott es ihm gezeigt hatte, schriftlich hinterlassen, so daß die Leser, wenn sie das Geschehene in Augenschein nehmen, Daniel bewundern können wegen der Ehre, die er von Gott empfangt, und herausfinden, daß die Epikureer geirrt haben, die die Vorsehung aus dem Leben verbannen und meinen, daß Gott die Weltgeschichte nicht lenkt.“⁹⁵ Die polemische Spitze dieser Worte des

93 In *Ant. Jud.* X 79 steht eine rätselhafte Angabe über Hesekiel: δὲ πρῶτος περὶ τούτων (sc. die Eroberung Jerusalems und die Einnahme von Babylon) δύο βιβλία γράψας κατέλιπεν. Siehe dazu K. Holl, *Das Apokryphon Ezechiel*, in: *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, Bd. II: Der Osten. Tübingen 1928, S. 33 ff.

94 Oben, S. 34.

95 Über diese auffallende Polemik gegen die Epikureer s. meinen Beitrag: *An attack on the Epicureans by Flavius Josephus*, in: W. den Boer, P.G. van der Nat. C.M.J. Sicking, J.C.M. van Winden (edd.), *Romanitas et Christianitas (Festschrift für J.H. Waszink)*, Amsterdam—London 1973, pp. 341–355.

Pharisäers Josephus tritt hier ebenso zutage wie die Aktualität Daniels; denn eine direkte Verbindung zwischen dem, was so lange vorhergesagt war, und der Gegenwart, wird entworfen: Roms Herrschaft und die Zerstörung Jerusalems.

Damit haben wir einen guten Übergang zu dem zweiten hervorragenden Propheten, zu Jeremia. In *Ant. Jud.* X 79 f. schreibt Josephus: „Dieser Prophet hat auch das schreckliche Schicksal der Stadt (Jerusalem) im voraus verkündigt und in Schriften auch Weissagungen über deren Einnahme hinterlassen, die jetzt in unserer Zeit stattgefunden hat, und über die Eroberung von Babylon. Und nicht allein er hat das dem Volk vorausgesagt, sondern auch der Prophet Hesekiel, der als erster zwei Bücher darüber geschrieben und hinterlassen hat.“ Man kann sich fragen, ob diese beiden hier als zwei Zeugen aufgeführt werden, die nach Deut. 19:15 die Wahrheit von Aussagen garantieren.⁹⁶ In der Darstellung des Josephus spielt dies Paar, wie wir noch sehen werden, eine besondere Rolle. Sehr ausführlich wird dann über das Lebensgeschick Jeremias gesprochen. Immer wieder wird gesagt, wie er den Untergang Jerusalems vorausgesagt hat und wie er deswegen als Verräter und Wahrsager betrachtet wurde. Auch wird nach Jer. 26 erzählt, wie die Weisen diese Anklage unter Hinweis auf das Beispiel des Propheten Micha und vieler anderer widerlegten, die nichts von den Königen zu leiden hatten und als Propheten Gottes geehrt wurden (X 88 ff.). Weiter: der Kampf Jeremias um die Seele des Königs Zedekia, sein Auftreten gegen die Pseudopropheten und gegen falsche Hoffnungen und sein Leiden durch die Führer des Volkes, die ihn der Zersetzung des Kampfgeistes beschuldigen—das alles wird ebenso ausführlich dargestellt wie Jeremias Haltung nach dem Fall Jerusalems. Alles geschah, wie der Prophet es seinen Zeitgenossen vorausgesagt hatte.

Leider erlaubt es die Zeit nicht, dies durch die eigenen Worte des Josephus zu illustrieren. Aber es wird wohl auch so deutlich sein, weshalb das Bild des Propheten, der gegen die Meinung seiner Zeitgenossen für die Unterwerfung unter Babylon plädiert hat, in der Zeit vor und nach der ersten Vernichtung Jerusalems so ausführlich gemalt wird. Konnte denn vor den Augen eines aufmerksamen Lesers die weitgehende Parallele zwischen der Predigt Jeremias sowie deren Bestätigung durch die Tatsachen und der Botschaft des Josephus an seine Volksgenossen unbemerkt bleiben? Nein, auch er hatte zur Übergabe aufgerufen und vor falschen Propheten gewarnt und wurde natürlich auch als Verräter betrachtet. Aber wie einst Jeremia, so war nun auch ihm durch den Ablauf der Geschehnisse recht gegeben. Deswegen ist Jeremias Geschichte so ausführlich erzählt, weil Josephus in diesem Gottesmann der heiligen Schrift

96 Vgl. darüber H. van Vliet, *No Single Testimony. A Study on the Adoption of the Law of Deut. 19:15 par. into the New Testament*, Utrecht 1958.

seinen Prototyp gefunden hat. Die *Archäologie* ist hier nicht alte, längst vergangene Geschichte, sondern von höchster Aktualität.

Nicht weniger aktuell war die Frage nach dem Kennzeichen des wahren Propheten. Josephus erwähnt des öfteren, wie in seiner Zeit Propheten auftraten, die beim Volk falsche Hoffnungen hervorriefen, die dann in Katastrophen endeten. Auch deshalb sind ihm die alttestamentlichen Geschichten wertvoll. Im Anschluß an Deut. 18:21 liegt für ihn das Kriterium in der Erfüllung: das Wort des wahren Propheten trifft ein.

Es ist merkwürdig, daß für Josephus Propheten ihre Botschaft nicht in Rätselsprüchen verkündigen, sondern in klarer Sprache. Ihnen wird nicht geglaubt, weil sie Unangenehmes sagen, wie das in Verbindung mit der Geschichte von Micha ben Jimla (*Ant. Jud.* VIII 418 ff.) deutlich ausgesprochen wird: Ahab starb, weil er nicht den Leuten, die die Niederlage vorhersagten, sondern denen, welche das ihm Angenehme prophezeit hatten, glaubte. Dabei ist auch von Bedeutung, daß die Worte der wahren Propheten miteinander übereinstimmen, obwohl es nicht immer sofort erkennbar ist. So ist es der Fall bei Micha mit den Worten des Elia über das Lebensende Ahabs. Sehr bezeichnend ist in dieser Hinsicht auch der scheinbare Widerspruch zwischen Jeremia und Hesekiel (*Ant. Jud.* X 106 f.; X 141: Verbindung von Jer. 41:3 und Hes. 12:13):

Der eine Prophet hat gesagt, der König Zedekia würde Babylon als Gefangener sehen, und der andere erklärte, er würde es nicht sehen. Die Geschichte löste indes die Schwierigkeit; denn Zedekia wurden die Augen ausgerissen, und so war er als Blinder in Babylon. Daran knüpft Josephus eine seiner zahlreichen, aber immer markanten Bemerkungen an: „Dies alles, das imstande ist, die Natur Gottes den Unwissenden genügend klar zu machen, haben wir erzählt, um zu zeigen, daß sie vielartig und mannigfaltig ist, daß alles zur rechten Zeit in angeordneter Weise eintrifft und daß er voraussagt, was geschehen soll. Auch haben wir damit die Unwissenheit und den Unglauben der Menschen gezeigt, durch den sie verhindert werden, etwas vom Ablauf im voraus zu sehen, und unbehütet dem Unheil ausgeliefert sind, so daß es ihnen unmöglich ist, dem zu entgehen“ (*Ant. Jud.* X 142).

Diese Erklärung ist für Josephus' Auffassung der Prophetie sehr bezeichnend. Im Hintergrund steht die Lehre von Gottes Vorsehung (*pronoia*),⁹⁷ die alles anordnet, aber die menschliche Verantwortung nicht aufhebt. Die Vorhersage dieser *Pronoia* wird konkret in der Vorhersage der Propheten. Deshalb sind die Propheten vertrauenswert und werden durch den Ablauf des

97 Über die göttliche *Pronoia* vgl. J. Behm προνοέω, πρόνοια, in: Kittel, *Theol. Wörterbuch*, Bd. IV. S. 1006–1010; A. Schlatter, *Wie sprach Josephus von Gott?*, Gütersloh 1910, S. 49 f.

Geschehens gerechtfertigt. Sie sprechen bei Josephus nicht in dunkler Rede, sondern finden allein wegen des Unglaubens ihrer Hörer kein Gehör.

Hier müssen wir abbrechen. Wir haben nur einige Aspekte des reichen Themas betrachten können. Es ist nur ein Ausschnitt, der sich uns dargeboten hat. Er hat jedoch, wie ich hoffe, gezeigt, welch tiefe Bedeutung die Prophetie für Josephus gehabt hat. Vielleicht hat er auch deutlich machen können, wie Josephus die Gestalten der wahren Propheten für seine jüdischen und heidnischen Zeitgenossen vergegenwärtigt.

IV Josephus in seiner Bedeutung für den Ausleger des Neuen Testaments

In der ersten Vorlesung habe ich darzulegen versucht, daß Josephus, obwohl er umfangreiche und bedeutsame historische Schriften hinterlassen hat, die in relativ guter Form überliefert sind, doch als ein im Grunde ziemlich vernachlässigter Autor bezeichnet werden muß. Das ist um so merkwürdiger, als er als Zeitgenosse der Autoren, die in den späteren Teilen des Neuen Testaments zu Wort kommen, nicht nur vieles aus der Zeit des Neuen Testaments beschrieben, sondern auch bewußt miterlebt hat.

In den beiden folgenden Vorlesungen wurde an einigen Beispielen, die Äußerungen des Josephus über sein Selbstverständnis und seine Arbeitsweise entnommen waren, aufgezeigt, wie viel noch zur Interpretation dieses Schriftstellers zu tun übrig geblieben ist. Man könnte mit einer gewissen Übertreibung, die ich mir um der Sache willen wohl erlauben darf, sagen, daß hier sogar noch alles auf die Bearbeitung wartet. Hoffentlich ist auch erkennbar geworden, wie ergebnisreich diese Arbeit sein kann. Diese Art der Beschäftigung mit unserem Historiker richtet sich auf ihn selbst und hofft, ihn vollauf zum Reden zu bringen. Natürlich präsentiert er sich dabei in erster Linie als Exponent des hellenistischen Judentums in Rom. Aber man kann sich doch auch fragen, ob er dabei nicht noch etwas mehr und dies vor allem dem neutestamentlichen Exegeten zu sagen hat, d. h. ob nicht durch das Studium seiner Schriften der Erforscher der apostolischen und der nachapostolischen Zeit zu einem besonderen Gewinn kommen kann.

Diese Frage, der die letzte Vorlesung gewidmet wird, ist mit Absicht in dieser persönlichen Form gestellt. Oft geschieht das deshalb nicht, weil man sich fürchtet, auf solche Weise damit ein sehr subjektives Element in die Arbeit hineinzubringen. Nun sollte man aber hier kein Verstecken spielen. Die Person des Forschers, seine Kenntnisse, seine Lebenserfahrungen lassen sich niemals ausschalten, und es ist nur sinnvoll, sich darüber im klaren zu sein. Die Frage

ist deshalb nicht, *ob*, sondern *wie* er mit im Spiel ist. Vor allem auf den Neutestamentler lauern bei der Interpretation seiner Texte, wie die Geschichte der Exegese zeigt, besondere Gefahren, gerade auch in einer vorschnellen und zu starken Verquickung von historischen und modernen Fragestellungen. Wir alle wissen, wie schwierig es ist, das Neue Testament nicht mit den Augen und Ohren eines Menschen des 20. Jahrhunderts zu lesen und zu hören, sondern mit denen eines Bewohners des Mittelmeergebiets im 1. Jahrhundert. Dennoch müssen wir es erst einmal so, wie es uns vorliegt, zur Kenntnis genommen haben, bevor wir die Botschaft für heute vernehmen können. Meiner Meinung nach ist Josephus, eben auch als Verfasser der *Archäologie*, ein ausgezeichnete Helfer, um uns die Verkündigung der Apostel im Rahmen ihrer Zeit hören zu lassen. Natürlich ist er es nicht als einziger; aber er ist dazu durch seinen Lebensgang doch besonders qualifiziert.

Die Aufgabe ist also nicht so zu formulieren: „Josephus' Bedeutung für das Studium des Neuen Testaments“.⁹⁸ Diese ist ja völlig klar. In der ersten Vorlesung wurde bereits daran erinnert, daß seit Beginn der historischen Exegese des Neuen Testaments unser Historiker auf den Gebieten der historischen und der geographischen Erklärung seine Beiträge geliefert hat und immer noch gute Dienste leistet, weil er über wichtige und beachtenswerte Informationen verfügte. Das ist so evident und selbstverständlich, daß wir dabei nicht lange zu verweilen brauchen. Natürlich ist es möglich, daß mit dem Fortschreiten gerade der Ausgrabungsarbeiten auch in dieser Hinsicht bei ihm noch mehr zutage gefördert wird. Man könnte etwa darauf hinweisen, daß die Qumran-Funde auch die Diskussion der Mitteilungen des Josephus über die Essener wieder stark belebt haben.

Dies Beispiel zeigt im übrigen, daß man, wenn hier vom Neuen Testament gesprochen wird, die Sache nicht zu eng fassen darf, sondern das Ganze der Welt des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Kirche mit in Betracht ziehen muß. Demgegenüber ist der in den dreißiger Jahren aufgeflamnte Streit über die Bedeutung des sogenannten slavischen Josephus und dessen Zeugnis über Jesus nach dem 2. Weltkrieg in der früheren Weise nicht wiederaufgenommen worden, und es sieht auch nicht so aus, als ob von dieser Seite her neues Licht zu erwarten ist. Vielleicht bringt aber die weitere Durchforschung der

98 Vgl. z.B. H. Montefiore, *Josephus and the New Testament*, London 1962 (Nachdruck von: *Novum Testamentum* IV, fasc. 2 und 4). Sein Ziel hat der Verfasser auf p. 7 so umschrieben: „The object of this study is to point out similarities between some important events recorded in the canonical Gospels and Acts on the one hand, and a series of prodigies recorded by Josephus in his Jewish War on the other hand, and to suggest a possible connection between them.“

Überlieferung in dieser Hinsicht doch noch unvermutete Einsichten—allerdings dürften sie, wenn es zu ihnen kommt, für den Kirchenhistoriker interessanter sein als für den neutestamentlichen Exegeten.

Wie man sich erinnern wird, hat vor vielen Jahren Max Krenkel in seinem Buch „Josephus und Lucas“⁹⁹ zu zeigen versucht, daß der Evangelist von dem jüdischen Historiker abhängig sei. Diese These hat im Feuer der Kritik nicht bestehen können. Das abweisende Urteil war m. E. richtig. Natürlich gibt es eine Anzahl von Punkten—man denke an den Zensus des Quirinius, den Aufstand des Theudas und das Lebensende des Herodes Agrippa—, in denen die beiden Autoren einander treffen. Daß hier ohne weiteres Josephus der Vorrang vor Lukas zu geben sei, läßt sich indes nicht sagen. Natürlich haben auch die Berichte des Josephus ihre Traditionsgeschichte hinter sich; auch dieser Historiker hat in seiner Weise, wie deutlich festgestellt werden kann, seine Quellen bearbeitet, und es wäre keine rechte historische Kritik, wollte man seine Darstellung ungeprüft annehmen, während man Lukas peinlichst verhört, nur weil er bewußt ein christlicher Schriftsteller ist. Es steht doch außer Zweifel, daß auch Josephus nicht ohne Tendenz geschrieben hat, und es scheint mir sogar, daß in diesem Gebiete, der Traditionsgeschichte bei Josephus, noch vieles zu untersuchen ist. Zu diesem Punkt werde ich deshalb nachher noch einiges bemerken.

Aber im Augenblick möchte ich zunächst noch den Blick auf einen anderen Aspekt richten. Obwohl es die Daten nicht erlauben, ein direktes Verhältnis zwischen Josephus und frühchristlichen Autoren anzunehmen, dürfen wir doch nicht vergessen, daß Josephus lange Jahre in Rom gelebt hat, und zwar in eben derselben Zeit wie der Verfasser des I. Klemensbriefes. Vor allem Rudolf Knopf und Adolf von Harnack haben auf die Beziehungen zwischen diesem Brief und dem hellenistischen Judentum hingewiesen.¹⁰⁰ Mir scheint, daß diese Verbindung insbesondere in der Richtung auf Josephus hin ausgedehnt und vertieft werden kann. Das sei an einem Punkt illustriert.

1. Klem. 4:12 wird der Aufruhr Korahs und seiner Genossen gegen Mose erwähnt: ihr Motiv ist Eifersucht, ihre Tat *στασιάσαι*. Bei Josephus (*Ant. Jud.* IV 11 ff.) wird diese Geschichte sehr ausführlich beschrieben als eine *stasis*, „so wie sie nach unserem Wissen niemals bei Griechen oder Barbaren dagewesen

99 M. Krenkel, *Josephus und Lucas. Der schriftstellerische Einfluß des jüdischen Geschichtsschreibers auf den christlichen*, Leipzig 1894.

100 R. Knopf, *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel, die zwei Clemensbriefe*, Tübingen 1920; A. v. Harnack, *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte. Das Schreiben der römischen Kirche an die korinthische aus der Zeit Domitians* (1. Clemensbrief), Leipzig 1929.

ist“, verursacht durch den Neid¹⁰¹ Korahs gegen Mose. I. Klem. 43 wird die Geschichte von dem blühenden Zweig als dem Zeichen der Auserwählung Aarons zum Priesteramt in eigenen Worten des Verfassers breit erzählt. Ebenso verfährt Josephus. Natürlich sind beide Autoren vom Alten Testament abhängig, und man kann nicht sagen, daß Klemens seine Weisheit aus Josephus geschöpft hat. Aber es besteht eine Gemeinschaft zwischen ihnen darin, daß beide diese alttestamentliche Geschichte als deutliches Beispiel der *stasis*, des Aufruhrs, bringen und durch Gottes Willen über die Einsetzung zum Priesteramt anschaulich machen. An vielen anderen Stellen kann man zudem terminologische Übereinstimmung wahrnehmen. Natürlich möchte ich daraus nicht schließen, daß Josephus und Klemens einander begegnet sind. Die Parallelität führt jedoch m. E. dahin, daß wir nicht nur vermutungsweise, sondern vielmehr in festen Umrissen sehen können, wie die Anschauungen der Synagoge an einem bestimmten Ort des Römerreichs waren.

Es ist auch deshalb interessant, Lukas mit Josephus zu vergleichen, weil beide ihre Botschaft an die hellenistische Welt richten. Der jüdische Historiker kann helfen, sich die geistliche Atmosphäre, in der auch Lukas geschrieben hat, deutlich vor Augen zu führen: so war die *Ambiance* der Synagoge! Dabei werden auch die Kontraste auffallen, und dadurch wird wiederum das geistige Profil des Lukas schärfer hervortreten. Ist es denn bis heute nicht so, daß man Lukas meistens mit anderen Christen verglichen hat und ihn daher in einem ganz bestimmten, hellenistischen Licht sieht? Es gibt aber noch eine andere Seite, die—das darf man doch wohl sagen—im Altertum wichtiger gewesen ist, nämlich die, daß Lukas kein Heide und auch kein Jude, sondern ein Christ war und als solcher anerkannt wurde. Der Vergleich zwischen ihm und Josephus ist mir deshalb so wichtig, weil man hier nicht durch chronologische Differenzen behindert wird, sondern mit Gleichzeitigkeit rechnen darf. Die Frage ist dann eben: Wie hebt sich der Christ Lukas von seiner Umwelt ab? Und dies war allem Anschein nach für Lukas selbst die wichtigste Frage.

In einer ganz anderen Hinsicht ist Josephus für den Neutestamentler von Bedeutung, nämlich im Blick auf seinen Gebrauch des Alten Testaments. Man kann dem in zwei Richtungen nachgehen.

Da ist erstens die theologische: Wie faßt Josephus die von den Propheten aufgezeichnete, von Gott inspirierte Heilige Schrift auf? Für ihn ist in diesen Büchern neben der Gesetzgebung eine Geschichte dargestellt. Mit einigen wenigen Ausnahmen in der Gesetzgebung, wo Josephus eine symbolische Deutung vorträgt, hält er an ihr als tatsächlichem Geschehen fest. Von einer allegorischen Auslegung ist nicht die Rede. Auch die Zukunftsaussagen haben

101 φθόνος; das Wort steht in 1. Klem. neben ζήλος und ist ein Wechselbegriff.

sich erfüllt oder werden sich noch einmal erfüllen. Hier besteht die m. E. sehr fruchtbare Möglichkeit eines Vergleichs mit dem Schriftgebrauch der neutestamentlichen Autoren. Natürlich muß man dabei in Anschlag bringen, daß Josephus ein Apologet des Judentums ist, ganz abgesehen von anderen Differenzen wie z. B. derjenigen, daß er nur das historische Element im Alten Testament verwendet und nicht auch die Psalmen, die Sprüche und vieles aus den Propheten. Aber wie dem auch sei, jedenfalls begegnet man bei Josephus einem anderen Gebrauch des Alten Testaments als bei Philo oder den Rabbinen oder in Qumran. Wie aber verhält sich dann dieser zu dem im Neuen Testament? Wie wird hier die heilige Schrift der heidnischen Umwelt angeboten und vorgestellt?

Damit verknüpft sich zweitens die Frage nach dem Selbstverständnis des jüdischen Volkes in der Auffassung des Josephus. Hier hat man nun einmal den Eindruck, daß es ihm genügt, wenn sein Volk in seiner Eigenart anerkannt wird und ruhig unter den anderen Nationen leben kann; eben deshalb schreibt er ja seine Bücher. Aber daneben zeigen sich auch Linien, die auf das Bild einer exemplarischen, einzigartigen Bedeutung des Judentums in der Welt hinlaufen. Jedenfalls ist es wichtig, auch diese Weise, in der das Alte Testament der heidnischen Welt präsentiert wurde, kennenzulernen.

Daneben können wir aus dem Gebrauch, den Josephus vom Alten Testament macht, noch etwas anderes lernen, nämlich wie er, der Historiker, mit seinen Quellen verfährt. Dann und wann beruft er sich bei der Darstellung der Geschichte seines Volkes auch auf andere Autoren und ist ein wenig stolz, wenn er das mit orientalischen Geschichtsschreibern oder mit Strabo fertigbringt. Aber sie dienen ihm doch nur zur Bestätigung dessen, was er mitteilt. Das Alte Testament hingegen ist, soweit es geht, die Hauptquelle. Josephus war dabei in einer glücklichen Lage. Mit historisch-kritischen Studien, etwa über im Alten Testament aufgezeichnete Parallelen oder über einander widersprechende Überlieferungen, hat er sich nicht einzulassen brauchen; denn für ihn war dort alles von inspirierten Propheten dargestellt (*c. Apion.* I 37). Diese Überlieferung lag ihm in einer wohlbehüteten Form vor. Er versuchte nicht, verschiedene alte Erzählungen miteinander zu vergleichen oder sie nebeneinander zu stellen und den Lesern das Urteil zu überlassen, wie wir das z. B. bei Diodorus Siculus finden; er brauchte sich nicht über Undeutlichkeit zu beklagen wie Strabo, der sich wegen der entgegengesetzten Erklärungen seiner Gewährsmänner vor Schwierigkeiten sah.¹⁰² Aber gerade deshalb ist es interes-

102 Strabo, *Geogr.* XII 8,7: γέγονε δὲ ἡ ἀσάφεια οὐ διὰ τὰς μεταβολὰς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὰς τῶν συγγραφέων ἀνομολογίας περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ λεγόντων. Nachdem er dafür einige Beispiele gegeben hat, schließt er mit folgenden Worten: ὅμως δὲ καίπερ τοιοῦτων ὄντων

sant zu sehen, wie er mit diesen inspirierten Quellen verfuhr und wozu er sich als berechtigt betrachtete. Bei seiner Arbeit hat er sich nach eigener Mitteilung (*c. Apion.* I 50) der Hilfe von Mitarbeitern, die der griechischen Sprache kundig waren, bedient. Hier darf wohl die Frage gestellt werden, wie weit diese Leute auch eingegriffen haben. Nach den Untersuchungen von Thackeray und Stein¹⁰³ betraf ihre Wirksamkeit vor allem die sprachliche Form. Jedenfalls darf man wohl ruhig annehmen, daß das Endprodukt so, wie es in die Öffentlichkeit geriet, von Josephus genehmigt wurde und sein „Imprimatur“ erhalten hat. Die Behandlung des vorliegenden Stoffes des Alten Testaments darf man also auf sein Konto schreiben.

In einem Vortrag ist es natürlich unmöglich, die Arbeitsweise unseres Historikers genau zu verfolgen und darzustellen; denn dazu wäre eine sorgfältige Vergleichung von Vorlage und Wiedergabe erforderlich, und das läßt sich im Sprechen und Hören nicht so leicht machen. Zudem würde das den Rahmen dieses Vortrags sprengen; denn man kann nicht sagen, daß Josephus überall dasselbe Verfahren angewandt hat. So sei ausdrücklich bemerkt: Die Situation ist nicht so, daß es erlaubt ist, die Ergebnisse der Arbeit, die auf diesem Gebiete schon geleistet ist, zu extrapolieren. Die Weise, in der Josephus mit den Gesetzen des Pentateuchs schaltete und waltete, ist nicht überall bei ihm maßgebend. Anderswo folgt er viel getreuer dem Leitfaden seiner Vorlage. Im allgemeinen kann man sagen, daß er bestrebt ist, nicht einfach die Gesprächsform des Alten Testaments zu bewahren, sondern die *oratio recta* in *oratio obliqua* umzusetzen. Auch spürt man oft die Tendenz, eine lange Geschichte zusammenzufassen und Dubletten zu vermeiden. Obwohl er stolz ist auf die reine Abstammung der Priester (*c. Apion.* I 33), läßt er doch allerlei Namenregister fort, wenn auch an einer Stelle (*Ant. Jud.* XI 68) mit Entschuldigung. Das Maß der Hellenisierung, das man in der Josephs-Geschichte festgestellt hat,¹⁰⁴ ist nicht überall das gleiche. An einigen Stellen fügt Josephus eine allgemeine Betrachtung ein, aber doch nicht überall da, wo man es erwartet. Seine Darstellung ist nicht „pathetisch“ und wirkt nicht mit Kunstmitteln, um bestimmte Affekte im Gemüt seiner Leser

πειρατέον διαιτᾶν ἕκαστα εἰς δύναμιν. ὅ τι δ' ἂν διαφύγῃ τῆς παλαιᾶς ἱστορίας, τοῦτο μὲν ἑατέον (οὐ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα τὸ τῆς γεωγραφίας ἔργον), τὰ δὲ νῦν ὄντα λεκτέον.

103 Thackeray, *l.c.*, p. 104 ff.; er spricht von „the immense debt which the author of the *Jewish War* owes to these admirable assistants“.—E. Stein, *De woordenkeuze in het Bellum Judaicum van Flavius Josephus*, Amsterdam 1937, hat diese Theorie geprüft und ist in seiner Untersuchung zu dem Ergebnis gekommen, daß die Arbeit dieser Mitarbeiter in der Hauptsache korrigierender Art war (*a.a.O.*, blz. 128).

104 Vgl. oben S. 43.

zu erregen. Zuweilen wird er jedoch von seinem Thema überwältigt. Aber bis heute ist es mir noch nicht gelungen, in solcher Um- und Überarbeitung bestimmte „Gesetze“ zu entdecken. Wohl spürt man die Freiheit, die hier in der Wiedergabe der Vorlagen herrscht. Obwohl er mit einem inspirierten Text arbeitet, macht er es so. Wie in der zweiten Vorlesung festgestellt wurde, gibt er seinen Lesern dazu die Versicherung, daß alles wahrheitsgetreu dargestellt werde. Ein Buchstäbler war er gewiß nicht. Man bekommt auch nirgends den Eindruck, daß er sich bewußt war, etwas Unerhörtes zu tun. Daß er die Geschichte seines Volkes in einer stilistisch angenehmen Form darbieten will, ist ohne weiteres klar. Aber dieser Apologet schreibt nicht *ad maiorem gloriam populi Iudaici*; denn Abfall und Ungehorsam den Gesetzen gegenüber werden nicht verschwiegen.

Die Quellenbehandlung bei Josephus spielt sich noch auf einer anderen Ebene ab. Es ist natürlich bekannt, daß der Anfang des *Bellum Judaicum* dieselbe Geschichte beschreibt wie die letzten Bücher der *Antiquitates* und daß diese viele Jahre nach jenem verfaßt wurden. Von daher erhebt sich die Frage: Wie ist ihr Verhältnis? Hier hat man ja die merkwürdige Tatsache vor sich, daß Josephus zweimal dieselbe Zeit geschildert hat. Auf Grund des Proömiums der *Archäologie* darf man nicht annehmen, daß er das *Bellum* vergessen hatte. In der zweiten Fassung ist die Darstellung viel ausführlicher, allerdings nicht, weil er eine Anzahl von Zusätzen gemacht hat. Aber wie ist dann das Verhältnis zu bestimmen?

Meistens wird diese Frage unmittelbar unter das historische Mikroskop gelegt, und es wird versucht, die historische Genauigkeit des einen oder des anderen Berichts festzustellen. Meinerseits fasse ich jetzt etwas anderes ins Auge: Wie hat Josephus in der zweiten Fassung die erste traktiert? Hier ist doch—und das ist das Interessante—er selbst seine Vorlage, ohne daß man von einer zweiten, verbesserten Auflage sprechen könnte. Sein Publikum war wohl in beiden Fällen dasselbe. Was macht er nun? Nach meinem Dafürhalten erwartet uns hier noch viel Arbeit, die nicht so leicht ist, nicht so einfach, wie es scheinen mag; denn mit glatten Erklärungen und Schablonen ist nichts zu erreichen. Das Wichtigste hier ist, daß wir Josephus in seiner Methode zu folgen vermögen, weil wir seine Quellen in der Hand haben. Es ist bei ihm nicht so wie bei vielen anderen antiken Historikern, daß man nur mit Mühe und Not seine Vorlagen wiederherstellen kann und dann auf Grund solch einer Rekonstruktion über Tendenzen usw. seine Schlüsse zieht. Wenn man bei Josephus am deutlich kontrollierbaren Material erkannt hat, wie er verfährt, ist es auch wohl möglich, in anderen Teilen seiner Werke, wo man die Quellen nicht zur Hand hat, bis zu einem gewissen Grade von Klarheit zu kommen. Es scheint mir auch, daß in dieser Hinsicht Josephus weit mehr, als es bis

heute der Fall ist, als ein ausgezeichnetes Beispiel der hellenistisch-römischen Historiographie vorgeführt werden kann. In vieler Hinsicht liegt bei ihm offen zutage, was bei anderen nur vermutet werden kann. Auch hier besteht kein Mangel an Fragen und Aufgaben.

Bei all diesen Ausführungen habe ich aber mein Thema für diese Vorlesung nicht aus den Augen verloren: Was kann ein Neutestamentler hier lernen? Meine Antwort ist: Sehr viel! Dabei denke ich vor allem an das synoptische Problem, aber auch an die Rekonstruktion von Vorlagen, die Paulus verarbeitet haben soll oder auf die er, wie man annimmt, reagiert. Wenn ich sehe, wie man auf diesen Gebieten, vor allem hier in Deutschland, oft ohne Respekt verfährt, dann mahnt uns das Studium des Josephus zur Besinnung. Vielleicht darf ich es hier einmal ganz offen aussprechen: Man scheint oft keine deutliche Vorstellung davon zu haben, daß das synoptische Problem eine der schwierigsten Quellenfragen ist, der ein Historiker überhaupt begegnen kann. Ich kann nur staunen, wenn ich den Leichtsinn beobachte, mit dem sich Anfänger hier heranwagen, wahrscheinlich deshalb, weil sie sich nicht der Schwierigkeit bewußt sind. So wird vielfach mit „Gesetzen der Formgeschichte“, mit „Sitzen im Leben“ gearbeitet, als ob es Tatsachen und nicht Hypothesen wären. Aus Wortstatistiken, aus Wortänderungen usw. werden weitgehende theologische Schlüsse gezogen. Und bestimmte bloße Behauptungen werden mit solcher Selbstverständlichkeit wiederholt, daß sie kritiklos von anderen übernommen werden. Wieso weiß man eigentlich, daß hinter dem, was die synoptischen Evangelien bieten, eine *lange* mündliche Tradition steht, in der sich allerlei theologische Änderungen vollzogen haben, die das ursprüngliche Geschehen bis zur Unkenntlichkeit entstellt haben? Man sollte bedenken, daß die Sachlage im Neuen Testament chronologisch ganz anders als beim Alten Testament ist und daß man deshalb für die Arbeit am Neuen Testament nicht einfach übernehmen kann, was in der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft erarbeitet worden ist. Wenn ich nach mehr als vierzig Jahren Erinnerungen an meine Studentenzeit schreiben würde, würden diese dann lediglich auf einer langen mündlichen Überlieferung beruhen? Aber, so heißt es, sind die Evangelien denn von gebildeten Leuten verfaßt? Sie sind doch Kleinliteratur! so wird man sagen. Trifft das aber etwa für Lukas zu? Ich habe, nebenbei bemerkt, einfache Bauern mit einem glänzenden Gedächtnis gekannt, das genaueste Erinnerung und auch Kontrolle ermöglichte.

Indes möchte ich davor warnen, nun voreilig zu schließen, daß ich einem undifferenzierten Fundamentalismus das Wort rede. *Me genoito!* Aber historisch-kritisch arbeiten heißt doch auch, Selbstkritik üben. Ich möchte also eine Art kritischer Rechtgläubigkeit zur Diskussion stellen. Ist es denn nicht an der Zeit, sich zu fragen, ob in der Evangelienforschung die Voraussetzungen und

die Ausgangspunkte wirklich so richtig sind, wie es oft kritiklos angenommen wird? Weil die Evangelien keine Biographien im modernen Sinn des Wortes sind und sie zudem keine Parallele in der antiken Literatur haben, scheint man sich der Untersuchung, wie sich im Altertum bestimmte literarische Entwicklungen vollzogen, überhoben zu fühlen. Natürlich möchte ich nicht behaupten, daß das Studium des Josephus uns den Schlüssel zur Lösung der synoptischen Frage in die Hand gibt. Wohl aber möchte ich sagen, daß man hier einem antiken Autor über die Schulter und auf seine Arbeit sehen und dabei begreifen lernen kann, was er machen konnte und wie er es machte. Vor allem deshalb, weil Josephus ein religiöser Schriftsteller und zudem ein Zeitgenosse der Evangelisten ist und aus dem Judentum stammte und für die heidnische Welt schrieb, ist er für uns so instruktiv. Mich jedenfalls hat er in seinem Arbeitszimmer gelehrt, vieles mit anderen Augen zu sehen, nämlich mit dem Blick des antiken Menschen, für den auch die Evangelisten schrieben. Nach meiner Erfahrung vollzieht sich ein solcher Lernprozeß nicht in Eile oder unter Kunstgriffen, sondern sehr langsam, sofern man ganz allmählich zu verstehen lernt, wie sich in der Welt des Altertums diese Tradition gebildet hat und sich ihre Darstellung und ihre Umformung vollzogen haben. Natürlich kann dies alles hier nur thesenartig vorgetragen und zugleich auf die Wahrheit des englischen Sprichwortes hingewiesen werden: „The proof of the pudding is in the eating.“

Dies alles gehört auch zu der Arbeit, die für das *Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti* zu leisten ist. Auch darüber möchte ich in diesem Zusammenhang etwas sagen, eine Art *Retractatio* geben. Nach dem, was Gerhard Delling und ich vor etwa zehn Jahren fast gleichzeitig, aber unabhängig voneinander, über das *Corpus Hellenisticum* oder den Neuen Wettstein gesagt haben,¹⁰⁵ erübrigt es sich, darüber ausführlich zu reden. Kurz gesagt, es ist der Zweck dieser Arbeit, aus den griechischen und lateinischen Schriftstellern des Altertums alle diejenigen Parallelen zu sammeln, die für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments relevant sind. Anfänglich war unter Ernst von Dobschütz und seinem Nachfolger Hans Windisch das Zentrum in Halle/ Saale. Während des zweiten Weltkrieges hat eine Teilung stattgefunden, indem das sogenannte Pagano-Hellenisticum nach Uppsala übergeführt wurde. Das Judaeo-Hellenisticum ist in Halle zurückgeblieben, und dort befindet sich noch

105 G. Delling, *Zum Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti*, in: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* LIV (1963), S. 1–15; W.C. van Unnik, *Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti*, Utrecht 1963 (auch in englischer Übersetzung in: *Journal of Biblical Literature* LXX III (1964), pp. 17–33).

immer die Arbeitsstelle, die für diesen Zweck zuständig ist, unter der Leitung von Gerhard Dellling. Heute brauchen wir uns nicht mit den Heiden, die jetzt in Utrecht und in Claremont (California) betreut werden, zu befassen; denn wir sprechen über einen jüdisch-hellenistischen Autor. Es ist evident, daß bei der heutigen Lage, die sich voraussichtlich nicht ändern wird, Josephus neben Philo der wichtigste Kontribuant zum Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum sein wird. Wir sprachen schon von der wichtigen Rolle, die er von jeher in der Auslegung des Neuen Testaments gespielt hat. Daß er diese auch weiter spielen wird, daran besteht kein Zweifel.

Nun läßt sich fragen, wie man das für das Neue Testament wichtige Material bei Josephus verarbeiten soll. Natürlich ist die Sache ziemlich einfach in allen Fällen, in denen es sich wie z. B. bei Theudas oder dem Lebensende des Herodes Agrippa 1 (Apg. 12) um kurze Mitteilungen handelt. Die ganze Biographie Herodes' des Großen braucht man nicht zu wiederholen, wenn man Matth. 2 illustrieren möchte, ebensowenig wie man alles, was in der antiken Literatur über Augustus gesagt wird, zu Luk. 2:1 anführen muß. In solchen Fällen sollte man m. E. nur aufnehmen, was eine bestimmte Seite des biblischen Berichts erläutern kann, z. B. die Grausamkeit des Herodes und seine Beziehungen zu den jüdischen Führern. Natürlich wird man öfter zusammenfassende Exkurse geben müssen, z. B. über den Tempel in Jerusalem, wie ihn Josephus und die Apostel gekannt haben, oder über die jüdischen Feste. Aber wie soll man es mit Josephus' Darstellung biblischer Figuren wie Abraham, Moses und David machen, die auch im Neuen Testament vorkommen? Dabei ist zu bedenken, daß nicht nur direkte Parallelen zur Beleuchtung des N.T. von Gewicht sind, sondern auch andere Akzentuierungen und Kontraste. Soll man die Information über die Essener zusammen mit den Berichten über die jüdischen *haireseis* aufnehmen oder sie fortlassen, weil diese Sekte im N.T. nicht erwähnt wird? So kann man noch viele Fragen aufwerfen und zudem Überlegungen anstellen, die natürlich nicht erst beim Fertigstellen des Manuskripts beantwortet werden können, sondern schon vorher bei der Materialsammlung. Josephus vermittelt in diesem Bereich eine große Menge von „tricky problems“.

Dazu kommt eine weitere Schwierigkeit, die sehr komplizierend wirkt und die ich früher unterschätzt oder vielleicht besser: übersehen habe. Als ich das erste Mal über die methodischen Grundsätze des Corpus zu sprechen hatte, habe ich die Teilung zwischen dem Judaeo-Hellenisticum und dem Pagano-Hellenisticum nicht so sehr aus praktischen Gründen (Arbeitsteilung) verteidigt als sie vielmehr durch den Hinweis darauf motiviert, daß die jüdisch-hellenistischen und die neutestamentlichen Schriftsteller durch ihre gemeinsame Beziehung zum Alten Testament und zum Judentum eine gewisse

Verbindung haben, während diese so fundamentale gemeinsame Grundlage in der Beziehung zu den paganen Autoren nicht besteht.¹⁰⁶ An sich ist das natürlich richtig. Nur ist damit doch noch nicht das Ganze gesagt. Josephus steht in der jüdischen Tradition, und selbstverständlich verdanken wir ihm viele Auskünfte, die nur er und kein heidnischer Schriftsteller bieten kann, weil er über Palästina und das Judentum schrieb. Indes ist er auch bewußt Hellenist. Ich habe schon darauf hingewiesen,¹⁰⁷ daß man bestimmte Ausdrücke und Wendungen bei Josephus nur versteht, wenn man den hellenistischen Sprachgebrauch kennt. Die Erfahrung hat mich gelehrt, daß erst die Kenntnis gewisser Gedankenkomplexe und Wortverbindungen und des *usus verborum* im Hellenismus uns instandsetzt, die Parallelen zwischen Josephus und dem Neuen Testament wahrzunehmen und so beide besser, richtiger, zu verstehen.

Mit einem Beispiel—*unum pro multis*—möchte ich die hier beschriebene Tatsache noch etwas näher erläutern. In der hellenistischen Welt war man allgemein davon überzeugt, daß es nicht jedwedem Menschen erlaubt sei, die göttlichen Geheimnisse zu kennen; nur diejenigen, die „würdig befunden“ waren, hatten Zugang zu ihnen, und diese Würdigkeit hatte man in einer Prüfung nachzuweisen. Nun trifft man auf diese Vorstellung auch bei Josephus in seiner Beschreibung der Zulassungszeremonien bei den Essenern; die von ihm verwendete Terminologie ist exakt-hellenistisch. Es ist sehr wahrscheinlich, daß er eine genaue Darstellung der Eintrittsriten, wie sie bei den Essenern geübt wurden, gibt. Diese Feststellung darf jedoch die Tatsache nicht verdecken, daß er hier gängige Mysterienterminologie verwendet, und das entdeckt man natürlich nicht, wenn man allein Josephus liest, sondern nur in Zusammenhang mit dem Hellenismus.¹⁰⁸ In einem Aufsatz über Offbg. Joh. 5 habe ich nachgewiesen, daß die dort häufig verwendete *axios*-Formel in denselben Zusammenhang hineingehört und erst von dorthin ganz verständlich wird.¹⁰⁹ Nur auf dem Wege über diesen hellenistischen Gedankenkomplex wird

106 W.C. van Unnik, *Second Report on the Corpus Hellenisticum*, in: *New Testament Studies* III (1957), p. 258.

107 S. oben S. 25.

108 Die Beschreibung bei Josephus. *Bell. Jud.* II 137 ss., vor allem 138: μετὰ γὰρ τὴν τῆς καρτερίας ἐπίδειξιν δυσὶν ἄλλοις ἔτεσι τὸ ἥθος δοκιμάζεται καὶ φανεῖς ἀξίος οὕτως εἰς τὸν ὅμιλον ἐγκρίνεται.—Wie bekannt, hat Josephus in *Vita* 2 die Essener mit den Pythagoräern verglichen. Für die Ordnung des Noviziats verweisen Michel-Bauernfeind (*a.a.O.* 1, S. 434f., Anm. 59) auf die Sektenrolle von Qumran (1 QS 6, 13–23), deren Bestimmungen „mit dem Bericht von Josephus weitgehend übereinstimmen“.

109 Vgl. meinen Artikel: „*Worthy is the Lamb*“. *The Background of Apoc. 5*, in: *Mélanges Bibliques en hommage au R. P. Bédaride Rigaux*. Bruges 1970, pp. 445–461, vor allem p. 454. Auf p. 458 habe ich auf eine Sachparallele zu *Sap. Sal.* 3:1 ff. hingewiesen.

hier eine „Parallele“ zwischen Josephus und dem Neuen Testament sichtbar. Dieser Fall ist gewiß keine Ausnahme. Dasselbe sieht man, wenn man Stellen wie *Ant. Jud.* V 33; VIII 111 über die Bedürfnislosigkeit Gottes als Parallelen zu Apg. 17:25 aufnimmt; denn wie Knopf u. a. nachgewiesen haben,¹¹⁰ drang diese Vorstellung aus dem Griechentum in das hellenistische Judentum und Frühchristentum ein, wobei noch dahingestellt bleiben mag, ob die Christen sie direkt aus hellenistischen Quellen schöpften oder durch jüdische Kanäle empfangen.

Mit diesen beiden Beispielen hoffe ich gezeigt zu haben, daß der Beitrag, den wir von Josephus zum Corpus Hellenisticum zu erwarten haben, oft nicht in unkomplizierter, direkter Weise zu uns kommt, sondern über einen Umweg. Deshalb kann man das Pagano-Hellenisticum und das Judaeo-Hellenisticum nicht durch wasserdichte Schotten voneinander abtrennen, sondern muß beide Bereiche auch in ständiger Verbindung auf ihre gegenseitige Hilfeleistung für die Exegese des Neuen Testaments hin untersuchen.

Damit bin ich an einem Punkt angelangt, über den ich zum Schluß meiner Ausführungen über die Bedeutung des Josephus für den Neutestamentler noch etwas sagen möchte. Ich meine das Problem der Hellenisierung des Christentums, das beim Studium der Entwicklung des frühen Christentums immer noch als ein Hauptproblem gilt. Ich betrachte mich als der Verpflichtung überhoben, breit vorzuführen, welche Rolle dieser Begriff in der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft und in der alten Kirchengeschichte gespielt hat und immer noch spielt. Wir alle, die wir bei Adolf von Harnack, den Religionsgeschichtlern, Rudolf Bultmann und anderen in die Schule gegangen sind, wissen darüber Bescheid. Vielleicht wird die Entwicklung heute nicht mehr als Abfall von etwas Ursprünglichem gewertet. In jedem Fall bedeutet aber der Übergang von dem Boden Palästinas in die Welt des Hellenismus doch soviel wie eine *metabasis eis allo genos*. Hat man denn nicht wirklich oft den Eindruck, daß die Urgemeinde und die hellenistischen Gemeinden streng voneinander getrennt waren und daß die andauernde und weitergehende Predigt in der hellenistischen Welt zu einer allmählichen Entartung des Evangeliums geführt hat? Wir brauchen das Problem in seiner historischen und theologischen Komplexität hier nicht weiter zu besprechen. Man gestatte mir nur zu bemerken, daß nach meinem Dafürhalten dieser Prozeß vielfach zu schematisch, zu simplifiziert dargestellt wird, zuviel Sache des Studierzimmers und nicht des wirklichen Lebens, auch des Glaubens, ist. Natürlich wird niemand in Abrede stellen, daß das Christentum im jüdischen Heimatland in einer anderen Umgebung lebte und vor andere Fragen gestellt war als in der Welt des

110 R. Knopf, *a.a.O.*, S. 129.

Hellenismus. Das Problem ist aber, wie das vor sich ging und was das bedeutete. So könnte es sein, daß der Gebrauch eines Schlagwortes wie Hellenisierung mehr verschleiert als erhellt.

Bei dieser Problematik scheint mir Josephus ausgezeichnete Hilfe leisten zu können. Hier sieht man an einem konkreten Menschen, dessen Lebensweg wir ziemlich genau in seiner Entwicklung verfolgen können, wie der Prozeß der Hellenisierung sich vollzog—zwar nicht bei einem Christen, sondern bei einem Juden, aber diese beiden sind doch durch den Glauben an die Offenbarung Gottes im Alten Testament verbunden. Die Unterschiede möchte ich nicht unterschätzen, die Analogie, die hier vorliegt, jedoch auch nicht übersehen; denn sie kann sehr instruktiv sein.

Es ist natürlich eine Binsenwahrheit, daß Josephus ein hellenistischer Jude war. Welcher Leser seiner Schriften würde das verneinen? Es zeigt sich nicht nur im Sprachkolorit, in dem sich, wie man glaubt feststellen zu können, die Farben verschiedener griechischer Prosaschreiber reflektieren, sondern auch in seinem Sprachgebrauch. Er spricht von *areté*, *to theion*, *pronoia* usw. Auf fast jeder Seite, die er geschrieben hat, springt der Hellenismus ins Auge, und in der Literatur wird er immer wieder erwähnt. Aber was besagt das? Und wie weit geht das?

Das Interessante im Falle des Josephus ist nicht nur, daß er so, wie wir ihn aus seinen Schriften kennen, ein hellenistischer Jude ist, sondern daß er hellenisiert ist. Der Unterschied zwischen ihm und einem anderen hellenistischen Juden, den wir gut kennen, nämlich Philo, darf nicht unter den Tisch fallen. Philo war im alexandrinischen Hellenismus geboren und erzogen. Es ist fraglich, ob er überhaupt Hebräisch gekonnt hat; er schreibt als Jude in der Sprache seiner Heimatkultur. Ganz anders Josephus, der als Priestersohn in Palästina aufgewachsen ist und als Pharisäer und Freiheitskämpfer eng mit dem Leben im besetzten heiligen Lande verbunden war. Es mag sein, daß er, wie Stein annahm,¹¹¹ in seiner Jugend auch Griechisch gelernt hat. Seine Geschichte des großen Krieges schrieb er jedenfalls auf Aramäisch, und für die Ausarbeitung der griechischen Übersetzung brauchte er sprachgewandte Helfer. Nicht von Anfang an, sondern als Erwachsener hat er wirklich im Bereich der hellenistischen Kultur gelebt, und das macht einen großen Unterschied, wie jedermann weiß, der einmal in zwei Welten gelebt hat. Dabei ist weiter stets zu bedenken, daß Josephus, als er ins römische Lager hinüberging und später in der hellenistischen Welt lebte, nicht, wie der Neffe Philos, seiner jüdischen Religion abgesagt hat. Im Gegenteil, er ist als ihr Verteidiger gegen die Verleumdungen eines Rhetors wie Apion und anderer aufgetreten

111 E. Stein, *a.a.O.*, blz. 3–4.

und hat das Alter und die Großartigkeit seines Volkes aller Welt gezeigt und die Vorzüglichkeit des jüdischen Gesetzgebers rühmend hervorgehoben. Auch als er hoch emporgestiegen war, hat er sich inmitten einer Welt, in der die Juden wegen ihrer sonderbaren Gebräuche oft geschmäht wurden, der väterlichen Gesetze nicht geschämt, sondern nachgewiesen, wie unheilvoll ihre Vernachlässigung für die Juden gewesen ist. Er kam nicht als erster Jude in die griechische Welt und brauchte nicht erst ein eigenes Vokabular zu schaffen. Er weiß, daß Volksgenossen von ihm schon einige Jahrhunderte außerhalb des gelobten Landes gelebt haben; er weiß von ihren Synagogen in der Fremde und ist wie der Verfasser des Aristeasbriefes auf die schöne Übersetzung der Septuaginta stolz, die die *areté* des Gottes Israels bekanntgemacht hatte.

Andererseits ist es für ihn ein Ruhmeszeichen des jüdischen Gesetzes, daß die wahren Israeliten ihm bis zum Tode Treue halten (*c. Apion. I 42 f.* und an andern Stellen). Das ist für ihn mehr als leere Rhetorik. Nicht umsonst hat er an das Ende seines *Bellum* das Heldenepos von Massada zusammen mit der Bewunderung der römischen Gegner gestellt.

Nirgends spürt man bei Josephus, daß er sich eines Unterschieds zwischen dem Judentum in der Heimat und dem in der Fremde bewußt gewesen ist, vorausgesetzt, daß die Möglichkeit besteht, nach den Gesetzen zu leben. Das Glück ist für ihn da, wo man ungehemmt das Gesetz praktizieren kann, und Unheil droht, wo das nicht der Fall ist. Die Sprache, die er verwendet, um das zentrale Anliegen seines Volkes zu verteidigen und für Außenstehende zu verdeutlichen, um die Wege Gottes mit seinem Volke darzustellen, ist nicht entscheidend. Josephus mag die hellenistische Terminologie verwenden; aber er bleibt Jude in Religion und Lebensführung. Die griechische Sprache dient ihm nur im Verkehr mit Leuten, die seiner Muttersprache nicht mächtig sind, hat aber als solche keine Änderung in seiner religiösen Zugehörigkeit mit sich gebracht. Diese wichtige Tatsache kann uns nicht verwundern, wenn wir bedenken, daß für das Judentum nicht eine rechte Lehre, sondern Gehorsam dem Gesetz gegenüber, nicht *Ortho-doxie*, sondern *Ortho-praxie* das Merkmal der Religion war und ist.

In dieser Beziehung ist natürlich die Ausgangslage für eine Hellenisierung des Judentums ganz anders als die des Christentums, wo nicht ein zu befolgendes Gesetz, sondern die Bedeutung Jesu Christi zentral und entscheidend war und ist. Deshalb konnte auch das hellenistische Judentum, das in Josephus seinen letzten für uns faßbaren Vertreter hat, als solches verschwinden, während doch das Judentum im Imperium Romanum weiter fortlebte und zugleich das junge Christentum zu einer immer tieferen Auseinandersetzung mit seiner religiösen Umwelt und einer immer bewußteren Verarbeitung des griechischen und römischen Geisteslebens fortschritt. Die Entwicklung des Josephus

in seinem Verhältnis zu seiner heidnischen Umgebung ist also bei näherem Zusehen nicht parallel und analog zu der des missionierenden Christentums. Dennoch ist es, wenn man von der Hellenisierung des Christentums spricht, wichtig, auf die Sachlage bei Josephus zu achten. Dadurch werden wir nämlich zu der Frage gedrängt, ob wirklich die Terminologie auch im Christentum so entscheidend gewesen ist, ob nicht, jedenfalls im Anfang, die Zugehörigkeit zu Christus Jesus hier dominant war. Es würde uns aber zu vielen neuen Problemkreisen führen, wollten wir diesem Gedanken weiter nachgehen.

Es ist ohnehin an der Zeit, abubrechen und zum Schluß zu kommen. Tatsächlich gilt es „abubrechen“; denn wir könnten mit der Behandlung unseres Themas „Probleme der Josephus-Forschung“ noch in vielen Richtungen weiter fortfahren. Ich bin mir bewußt, vieles nur gestreift zu haben; viele Fragen und Aufgaben, die früher schon aufgegriffen sind oder noch der Bearbeitung harren, sind nicht behandelt. Mit Vorbedacht habe ich vor allem die Aufmerksamkeit auf Themata aus den *Antiquitates* gelenkt und an zwei Beispielen ausführlich zu zeigen versucht, auf welche Weise meiner Meinung nach die Josephus-Forschung weitergetrieben werden kann und muß und wie sie auch für das Studium des Neuen Testaments in seiner konkret-geschichtlichen Situation fruchtbar gemacht werden kann.

Wie jede wissenschaftliche Arbeit hat auch diese Vorlesungsreihe eine biographische Seite. Im Laufe meiner Studien habe ich ziemlich viel Josephus gelesen. Anfänglich ging es mir nur darum, Informationen über sog. historische Fakten zu empfangen. Je länger desto mehr entdeckte ich dann, daß Josephus, im Zusammenhang mit seiner Umgebung gesehen, weit reichere Einsichten vermittelt, als es bei oberflächlicher Beschäftigung mit ihm der Fall zu sein scheint. Ich hoffe, darin nicht fehl gegangen zu sein. Jedenfalls war es eine Freude, davon etwas zu zeigen, und ich bin besonders dankbar, daß die willkommene Einladung nach Münster mir Gelegenheit bot, darüber zu reden. Möge der Erforschung des Flavius Josephus, dieses vernachlässigten Autors, eine schöne Zukunft beschert sein, auch durch die Arbeit, die im Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum geleistet wird!

Eine merkwürdige liturgische Aussage bei Josephus

Im vergangenen Jahrzehnt hat der verehrte Kollege Otto Michel zusammen mit seinen Mitarbeitern durch die Herausgabe des „Bellum Judaicum“ von Josephus und durch die vielen wertvollen Anmerkungen in diesen Bänden der Erforschung des Neuen Testaments und seiner Zeitgeschichte einen großen Dienst geleistet. Darum ist es wohl angemessen, in einem Beitrag zu einer neuen Festschrift für den Jubilar eines von den vielen Problemen zu behandeln, die dieser jüdische Historiker in reichem Maße bietet¹. Man freut sich dann besonders, wenn man einen Text besprechen kann, der das Thema „Danken“ berührt. Zwar geht es an der Stelle, mit der wir uns befassen wollen, um den Dank an Gott. Aber ist es im christlichen Leben nicht immer so, daß ein Dank an einen Menschen letzten Endes doch Gott gilt, der diesen Menschen zu seiner Arbeit befähigt hat? Das gilt ganz gewiß dann, wenn dieser Mensch wie unser Jubilar seine Lebensaufgabe und Lebensfreude in der Auslegung des Wortes Gottes gefunden hat.

Es nimmt nicht wunder, daß Josephus in seinen *Antiquitates* dem Bau und der Einweihung des salomonischen Tempels viel Aufmerksamkeit geschenkt hat. Seine Darstellung folgt im großen und ganzen der alttestamentlichen Vorlage. Aber ein genauerer Vergleich zeigt, daß er in seiner Wiedergabe ein nicht unbedeutendes Stück hinzugefügt hat, und zwar im Gebet, das Salomo spricht (Ant 8,111–113). Diesem Zusatz ist die folgende Untersuchung gewidmet.

Die Nacherzählung des Josephus in Ant 8,106ff. verhält sich zum Bericht in 1 Kön 8 par. 2 Chr 5 wie folgt: Josephus gibt 1 Kön 5,10–13 ausführlich wieder. Vor allem in den Worten Salomos hat er einiges aufgefüllt, aber das ist nur Verschönerung (§106–108). Dann werden die nächsten Bibelverse (14–21) in indirekter Rede zusammengefaßt, wobei das prophetische Element in den Worten unterstrichen wird (§109f.).² Darauf folgt im Bibeltext das berühmte große Tempelweihgebet Salomos (1 Kön 8,22–53). Den größten Teil davon (V. 27–53) mit der breiten Aufzählung verschiedener Anlässe zum Gebet hat Josephus §114–118 so zusammengefaßt, daß die Motive zwar genannt, die Wiederholungen im einzelnen aber vermieden werden. Die Einleitung zu diesem Gebet (1 Kön 8,22–26) ist jedoch stark geändert. Während Salomo sich im biblischen Text Gott gegenüber auf dessen Treue gegenüber David und

1 Vgl. darüber meine Delitzsch-Vorlesungen, gehalten in Münster/Westfalen, 13., 14. Dezember 1972, die bei Kohlhammer (Stuttgart) veröffentlicht werden.

2 In der dritten Delitzsch-Vorlesung habe ich ausführlich über die Prophetie bei Josephus gesprochen.

seinem Haus beruft, fehlt dieses Moment bei Josephus³. An seiner Stelle steht nur eine Bitte, das Haus Davids zu segnen (§113). Das Auffälligste ist jedoch, daß unser Verfasser in §111–112 eine ganz andere Einleitung eingefügt hat, in der er über das rechte Beten spricht. Der Text lautet: (111) ταῦτα διαλεχθεὶς πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀφορᾷ πάλιν εἰς τὸν ναὸν καὶ τὴν δεξιάν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνασχὼν ἔργοις μὲν, εἶπεν, οὐ δυνατὸν ἀνθρώποις ἀποδοῦναι θεῷ χάριν ὑπὲρ ὧν εὖ πεπόνθασιν. ἀποσθεὲς γὰρ τὸ θεῖον ἀπάντων καὶ κρεῖττον τοιαύτης ἀμοιβῆς. ᾧ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων ζώων ὑπὸ σοῦ δέσποτα, κρεῖττονες γεγόναμεν, τούτῳ τὴν σὴν εὐλογεῖν μεγαλειότητα καὶ περὶ τῶν ὑπηργμένων εἰς τὸν ἡμέτερον οἶκον καὶ τὸν Ἑβραίων λαὸν εὐχαριστεῖν ἀνάγκη. (112) τίμη γὰρ ἄλλω μᾶλλον ἰλάσασθαι τε μνηνόντα καὶ δυσμεναίνοντα εὐμενῇ (δεξιούσθαι) ἀξιώτερον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν ἢ φωνῇ ἣν ἐξ ἀέρος τ' ἔχομεν καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ πάλιν ἀνιούσαν οἶδαμεν; χάριν οὖν ἔχειν δι' αὐτῆς ὁμολογῶ σοι περὶ τε τοῦ πατρὸς πρῶτον, ὃν ἐξ ἀφανοῦς εἰς τοσαύτην ἀνήγαγες δόξαν, (113) ἔπειθ' ὑπὲρ ἑμαυτοῦ πάντα μέχρι τῆς παρούσης ἡμέρας ἃ προείπας πεποιηκότι, δέομαί τε τοῦ λοιποῦ κτλ.

Soweit mir bekannt, ist dieser Text bis heute noch keiner genaueren Interpretation unterzogen worden⁴, wie er es verdient hätte. Auch in diesem Falle⁵ bringt eine scharfe Beobachtung der Wortwahl eine interessante Stellungnahme des Josephus ans Licht.

Im Mittelpunkt dieser Aussagen steht die Danksagung, die dreimal erwähnt wird: ἀποδοῦναι θεῷ χάριν—εὐχαριστεῖν—χάριν... ἔχειν. Sie bildet die Einleitung zum eigentlichen Bittgebet. Diese Dankabstattung ist nicht eine Freundlichkeit oder Höflichkeit Salomos, sondern eine Notwendigkeit (ἀνάγκη⁶), der er sich nicht entziehen kann. Die Gründe werden angegeben: περὶ τῶν ὑπηργμένων εἰς τὸν ἡμέτερον οἶκον καὶ τὸν Ἑβραίων λαόν und später περὶ τε τοῦ πατρὸς πρῶτον... ἔπειθ' ὑπὲρ ἑμαυτῷ, weil Gott getan hat, was Er vorhergesagt hat. Über diese Konstruktion der Danksagung hat seinerzeit Paul Schubert im Zusammenhang mit der paulinischen Danksagung ausführlich

3 Es wird nur gesagt: ἃ προείπας.

4 H. Wenschkewitz, Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament, Leipzig 1932, S. 23, handelt wohl über die Einleitung, §107, aber nicht über unseren Text.—A. Schlatter, Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josephus, Gütersloh 1932, spricht auf S. 109 über εὐχαριστεῖν, aber nicht über diese Stelle. Schlatter bietet viel Material zum Thema „Lobpreis und Gebet“ bei Josephus, a.a.O. S. 108–113, aber nur in der Form von Stellenangabe ohne den geistigen Kontext.

5 Dafür möchte ich auf meine Delitzsch-Vorlesungen verweisen.

6 Vgl. H.G. Liddell – R. Scott – H.St. Jones, A Greek-English Lexicon, Oxford 1940, S. 106. W. Grundmann, in: ThWl, 1932, S. 347ff., s.v.—Man denke an Paulus' Wort 1 Kor 9,16, obwohl ich bezweifle, ob man hier mit Grundmann, S. 350, von einem „(göttlichen) Muß“ sprechen soll.

gehandelt⁷. Es erübrigt sich deshalb, hier ausführlicher auf die Sache einzugehen. Aber ein Punkt, der dort nicht besprochen wurde, soll erläutert werden, nämlich eben diese „Notwendigkeit“.

In Verbindung mit diesem Begriff sei noch hingewiesen auf ein anderes Wort. Josephus sagt, daß man Gott seinen Dank nicht mit Taten abstaten könne, weil Er über ein solches Entgelt (ἀμοιβή) erhaben sei. Das, was man eigentlich erwarten könnte, gilt also für Gott nicht.

Wir stoßen hier auf einen bei den Griechen weit verbreiteten Gedanken: wer eine Wohltat empfangen hat, ist gehalten, seine Dankbarkeit durch eine Gegengabe zu erweisen. In seinem schönen Buch „Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum“ hat der Althistoriker H. Bolkestein die große Bedeutung dieser Regel für die griechische Ethik mit vielen Beispielen erläutert⁸. Wir brauchen das Material hier nicht zu wiederholen⁹, doch kann es durch einige Stellen aus Josephus ergänzt werden, die dessen Kenntnis des Gedankens deutlich zeigen (die Texte sind willkürlich und ohne Anspruch auf Vollständigkeit herausgegriffen):

Ant 5,30 (nach der Eroberung Jerichos): καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχείσῃ (sc. Rachab) χάριν ἔχειν ὡμολογεῖ τῆς σωτηρίας τῶν κατασκόπων καὶ μηδὲν τῆς εὐεργεσίας ταύτης ἔλεγεν ἔν ταῖς ἀμοιβαῖς ἡττων φανήσεσθαι. (Beachte die starke terminologische Parallelität zu der in diesem Aufsatz behandelten Stelle!)

Ant 19,225, von Claudius, der von den Soldaten zum Kaiser gemacht worden war: μνημονεύσεις τε χάριτος αὐτοῖς ἀποδιδόντα τιμὴν ἢ ἐπὶ τοιοῦτοῖς γένοιτ' ἂν ἀρκοῦσα.

Ant 19,184 stellt die allgemeine Regel auf: ἔργον δὲ κάλλιστον καὶ ἐλευθέρις ἀνδράσι πρέπον ἀμείβεσθαι τοὺς εὐεργέτας.

Diese Regel wurde auch auf das Verhalten der Menschen gegenüber Gott, ihrem Wohltäter, angewandt. Eine interessante Überlieferung findet man bei Diodorus Siculus, Hist I 90,2, wo er eine Erklärung zur ägyptischen Tierverschlingung gibt: die Tiere haben göttergleiche Ehren erlangt, weil sie als Totems die Menschen voneinander abgesondert haben, so daß sie sich nicht zerfleischen. Dann fügt Diodorus hinzu: καθόλου δὲ φασὶ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους εὐχαρίστως διακείσθαι πρὸς πᾶν τὸ εὐεργετοῦν, νομίζοντες μεγίστην ἐπικουρίαν εἶναι τῷ βίῳ τὴν ἀμοιβὴν τῆς πρὸς τοὺς εὐεργέτας χάριτος.

7 P. Schubert, Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings, Berlin 1939, vor allem S. 150ff.

8 H. Bolkestein, Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum, Utrecht 1939. Vgl. auch meinen Aufsatz: Die Motivierung der Feindesliebe in Lukas VI 32–35, in: NovTest VIII (1966), S. 284ff.

9 Vgl. auch H. Conzelmann, χάρις etc., in: ThW IX (1971). S. 364f., 380f., 397ff.

δηλον γὰρ εἶναι διότι πάντες πρὸς εὐεγείαν ὁρμήσουσι τούτων μάλιστα παρ' οἷς ἂν ὁρῶσι κάλλιστα θησαυρισθησομένας τὰς χάριτας.

Hier ist auch deutlich das Prinzip des „do ut des“ ausgesprochen, das bekanntlich in der Opferpraxis eine beträchtliche Rolle gespielt hat¹⁰: die Entrichtung des Entgelts erwirkt Hilfeleistung.

Wie der Verkehr zwischen den Göttern und Menschen als ein gegenseitiger Austausch von Gaben aufgefaßt wurde, zeigt Plato an einer Stelle im Symposion (202 E): ἐρμηνεύον καὶ διαπορθμεύον (sc. die Dämonen) θεοὶς τε παρ' ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἀνθρώποις τὰ παρὰ θεῶν, τῶν μὲν τὰς δεήσεις καὶ θυσίας, τῶν δὲ τὰς ἐπιτάξεις τε καὶ ἀμοιβὰς τῶν θυσιῶν. Deshalb spottet Sokrates in Euthyphro 14 E, daß die Frömmigkeit einem Handelsgeschäft ähnlich sei: ἐμπορικὴ ἄρα τις ἂν εἴη ὧ Εὐθύφρων τέχνη ἢ οἰότης θεοῖς καὶ ἀνθρώποις παρ' ἀλλήλων. In dieser Beziehung ist auch von Bedeutung, was Porphyrius, De Abstinencia IV 22 mitteilt aus einer Betrachtung des Xenokrates, des Nachfolgers Platons in der Leitung der Akademie; bezugnehmend auf die Gebote des Triptolemus in Eleusis sagt er: δεῖ γὰρ τοὺς μὲν γονεῖς εὐεργέτας ἡμῶν γεγεννημένους ἀντ' εὖ ποιεῖν ἐφ' ὅσον ἐνδέχεται, τοῖς θεοῖς δὲ ἀφ' ὧν ἔδωκαν ἡμῖν ὠφελίμων εἰς τὸν βίον ἀπαρχὰς ποιεῖσθαι.

Hier ist die Sache des Dankes für empfangene Wohltaten also verbunden mit Opfer. Das wird oft ausgesprochen.

Bei Josephus findet sich diese Bestimmung des Verhältnisses zwischen Gott und Mensch auch, z.B. in Ant 8,300, wo in der Warnung an einen gottlosen König gesagt wird: ὅτι βασιλεὺς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ (sc. Gott) γενόμενος οὐκ ἡμείψατο τὴν εὐεργεσίαν τῷ δικαίως προστῆναι τοῦ πλήθους καὶ εὐσεβῶς (vgl. 1 Kön 16,1ff., aber in anderer Formulierung). Hier besteht also die Rückgabe nicht im Opfer, sondern in der Lebensführung, wobei Frömmigkeit und Gerechtigkeit als die beiden Seiten des Gesetzes miteinander verquickt sind¹¹. Das ist sehr merkwürdig, denn die Opfer werden bei Josephus an sich nicht abgelehnt oder herabgesetzt¹². Doch stellen sie noch nicht die richtige Gegengabe für Gottes Wohltaten dar. An unserer Stelle wird expressis verbis gesagt, daß das auch unmöglich sei: ἔργοις μὲν . . . οὐ δυνατόν ἀνθρώποις ἀποδοῦναι θεῷ χάριν ὑπὲρ ὧν εὖ πεπόνθασιν (= das Passivum zu εὐεργετεῖν). Nun wird im Verlauf der Erzählung berichtet, wie Salomo nach Schluß seines Gebets doch noch großartige Opfer bringt (Ant 8,122 im Anschluß an 1 Kön 8). Aber durch diese vorausgehenden Aussagen

10 G. van der Leeuw, Do ut des, in: Archiv für Religionswissenschaft XX (1921), S. 241ff.

11 Vgl. A. Schlatter, a.a.O. S. 37 (das Material läßt sich leicht vermehren); W. Foerster, εὐσεβής, in: ThW VII (1964), S. 176, 179f.

12 Vgl. A. Schlatter, a.a.O. S. 122ff.

sind die Opfer stark relativiert. Sie waren zwar im altväterlichen Gesetz vorgeschrieben und werden deshalb dargebracht, aber selbständige Bedeutung haben sie nicht: der Mensch kann seinen Dank für Gottes Wohltaten nicht mit seinen Taten und durch seine Aktivität abstaten. Das wird in zweifacher Weise begründet: erstens mit dem Gedanken, daß Gott ἀπροσδεής ist und also keiner Opfer bedürfe,—ein Motiv, dem man im Imperium Romanum bei heidnischen Philosophen, Juden und Christen in der Polemik gegen Opfer immer wieder begegnet¹³; es ist also ein *Topos*, der für Josephus hier ausschlaggebend ist;—und zweitens mit dem Gedanken, daß Gott über ein derartiges Tauschgeschäft erhaben ist; und dabei denke man an die oben angeführten Worte des Sokrates, deren polemische Spitze unüberhörbar ist.

Nun steht dieser Satz, der die Opfer und anderen menschlichen Taten als minderwertig und Gottes nicht würdig abqualifiziert, in einer Gegenüberstellung (μὲν . . . δέ). Es ist ein ganz auffälliger Gegensatz, der hier ins Spiel gebracht wird: nicht mit Taten, sondern mit dem, worin wir den anderen Geschöpfen überlegen sind, sollen wir Gott danken (Ant 8,122). Es ist bekannt, daß in der antiken Literatur die Verbindung von Wort und Tat ganz geläufig ist¹⁴. Diese beiden sollen im Leben eines guten Menschen immer verbunden sein; klaffen sie dagegen auseinander—und sie stehen oft genug im Widerspruch—so wird immer der Tat der Vorzug gegeben. Das kommt so häufig zur Sprache, daß es sich erübrigt, Beispiele anzuführen. Auch Josephus denkt häufig auf dieser Linie; aus vielen Stellen seien vier mehr oder weniger zufällige Beispiele zitiert:

Ant 6,286: λόγος μὲν ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρα πέφυκεν ἀληθῆς τε καὶ ψευδῆς, τὰ δ' ἔργα γυμνῇν ὑπ' ὀψει τὴν διάνοιαν τίθῃσι.—Ant 7,119 (= 2 Sam 10,4) von der Beleidigung der Gesandten durch den König der Ammoniter ἔργοις ἀπέλυσε κομίζοντας, οὐ λόγοις τὰς ἀποκρίσεις.—Ant 10,39 man glaubt die Worte der Propheten nicht: οἱ δὲ τοῖς μὲν λόγοις οὐκ ἐπίστευον . . ., τοῖς δ' ἔργοις ἔμαθον ἀληθῆ τὰ παρὰ τῶν προφητῶν.—C Ap 2,102: insensatos enim non verbis, sed operibus decet arguere.

13 Siehe das Material in R. Knopf, Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel. Die zwei Clemensbriefe, Tübingen 1920, S. 129; H. Windisch, Der Barnabasbrief, Tübingen 1920, S. 310f.; M. Dibelius, Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte, Göttingen 1951, S. 44ff.—Über dieses Thema hoffe ich eine eigene Abhandlung vorzulegen.

14 Das Material bei G. Bertram, ἔργον, in: ThW II (1933), S. 647, und W. Bauer, Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur, Berlin 1958, Sp. 608, ist dürftig und gibt keinen Eindruck davon, wie häufig der Gegensatz in der griechischen Literatur gefunden wird.

Durch den sehr pointierten Gebrauch von ἔργοις am Anfang (Ant 8,111) wird man selbstverständlich dazu gebracht, an diese Tradition zu denken, wundert sich dann aber darüber, daß hier ein umgekehrtes Vorzeichen gesetzt wird. Nur ist auffällig, daß Josephus hier nicht von λόγος, sondern von φωνή spricht; aber sachlich sind diese beiden Wörter in diesem Zusammenhang von gleicher Bedeutung. Er mag λόγος bewußt vermieden haben, um den Widerspruch zu der geläufigen Regel nicht zu stark hervortreten zu lassen. Wahrscheinlich aber schien φωνή ihm besser zu passen in Verbindung mit dem „Hinaufsteigen“ (§112). Josephus sieht hier in der Stimme den Unterschied zwischen Mensch und Tier, die beide unter den Begriff ζῶον zusammengefaßt werden (vgl. Ant 1,41). In der griechischen Literatur werden die Tiere sehr oft als ἄλογα ζῷα bezeichnet¹⁵, wobei der Unterschied zum Menschen also im λόγος (Sprache oder Vernunft) liegt. Josephus aber wählt den Begriff φωνή, will aber dennoch eine seiner Meinung nach allgemein angenommene Auffassung wiedergeben. In Ant 1,41 sagt er, daß im Paradies alle Lebewesen die gleiche Sprache hatten (ὁμοφωνούντων . . . τῶν ζῶων ἀπάντων), und in §50 wird dann berichtet, daß Gott nach dem Sündenfall der Schlange die Sprache abnahm (ἀφείλετο δὲ καὶ τὸν ὄφιν τὴν φωνήν). Anscheinend hat Josephus diese Feststellung stillschweigend generalisiert und darin den Grund für seine Aussage an unserer Stelle gefunden. Auch Philo spricht in De Somniis I 5 §29 von τῆς ἐνάριθρου φωνῆς, ἣν μόνος ἐκ πάντων ζῶων ἔλαχεν ἄνθρωπος¹⁶.

Die Stimme wird aus Luft geformt, ein Gedanke aus der stoischen Schule¹⁷, und geht mit der Luft nach oben, auch ein Gedanke, den man in der griechischen Vier-Elemente-Lehre öfter antrifft¹⁸. Man vergleiche hiermit, was Josephus kurz vorher in Ant 8,108 gesagt hat: ὡς ἂν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ (sc. der Tempel) σοι τὰς εὐχὰς θύοντες καὶ καλλιεροῦντες ἀναπέμπωμεν εἰς τὸν ἀέρα. Bei Philo, De Somniis I 22 §134 ist Jakobs Leiter Symbol für die Luft: sie stand auf der Erde

15 Cf. G. Kittel, λόγος usw., in: ThW IV (1942), S. 145 s.v. ἄλογος, und W. Bauer, Wörterbuch, Sp. 81.

16 Cf. Aetius, Placita IV 19,1, in: H. Diels, Doxographi Graeci, Berlin 1879, S. 408 λέγεται δὲ καὶ καταχρηστικῶς ἐπὶ τῶν ἀλόγων ζῶων φωνή . . . κυρίως δὲ φωνὴ ἐναριθρὸς ἐστὶν ὡς φωτίζουσα τὸ νοούμενον.—Über φωνή O. Betz, in: ThW IX (1971), S. 272ff, 283ff.

17 Siehe Scholia Arati V 1 (ap.J.ab Arnim, Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta, Leipzig 1903, vol. II p. 43 οἱ γὰρ Στοικοὶ ὑποτίθενται, μᾶλλον δὲ πάντες οἱ ὄρον φωνῆς γράψαντες πεπληγμένον ταύτην ἀέρα καλοῦσιν. Andere Stellen sind angegeben bei von Arnim, Index, s.v. φωνή, vol. IV, p. 161.

18 Vgl. Chrysippus, ap. ab Arnim, Stoic. Vet. Fragm., II p. 175: τεσσάρων οὖν ὄντων τῶν στοιχείων, συμβέβηκε τὸ πῦρ καὶ τὸν ἀέρα, κουφότατα ὄντα, ἐπὶ τὴν ἄνω φωρὰν ἔχειν τὴν ὁρμὴν καὶ περιδινεῖσθαι (vgl. andere Stellen, angegeben im Index, vol. IV, p. 6–7).—Siehe auch A. Lumpe, Elementum, in: Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum, Stuttgart 1959, Bd. IV, Sp. 1076ff.; G. Dellling, στοιχεῖον, in: ThW VII (1964), S. 672ff.

und reichte bis zum Himmel. Natürlich ist die Luft deshalb am meisten geeignet, den Kontakt mit Gott herzustellen, weil sie als immateriell und nach oben strebend gilt. Die Stimme, die aus Luft gemacht ist, teilt diese Eigenschaften und ist am meisten würdig, den Zorn Gottes zu besänftigen¹⁹; in ihrem immateriellen Wesen stimmt sie am besten mit Gottes Wesen überein. Darum also ist das gesprochene Gebet der richtige Dank an Gott.

Mit solchen Ausführungen steht Josephus in einer Linie mit Philo. Am deutlichsten zeigt sich das, wenn man des Alexandriners *De Plantatione* 31 §130–131 zu Vergleich danebenstellt: οἰκειότατόν ἐστιν ἔργον θεῷ μὲν εὐεργετεῖν, γενέσει δὲ εὐχαριστεῖν μηδὲν ἕξω τούτου πλέον τῶν εἰς ἀμοιβήν ἀντιπαρασχεῖν δυναμένη. ὁ γὰρ ἂν θελήσῃ τῶν ἄλλων ἀντιχαρίσασθαι, τοῦθ' εὐρήσεται τοῦ πάντα πεπονηκότος, ἀλλ' οὐ τῆς κομιζούσης φύσεως κτῆμα ἴδιον. μαθόντες οὖν ὡς ἐν ἔργον ἡμῖν ἐπιβάλλει μόνον ἐν τοῖς πρὸς τιμὴν θεοῦ, τὸ εὐχάριστον, τοῦτο αἰεὶ καὶ πανταχοῦ μελετῶμεν διὰ φωνῆς καὶ γραμμάτων ἀστειών, d.h. Lobreden und Loblieder; cf. auch vorher 30, §126: ἐκάστη μὲν γε τῶν ἀρετῶν ἐστὶ χρήμα ἅγιον, εὐχαριστία δὲ ὑπερβαλλόντως. θεῷ δὲ οὐκ ἔνεστι γνησίως εὐχαριστῆσαι δι' ὧν νομίζουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ κατασκευῶν ἀναθημάτων θυσιῶν οὐδὲ γὰρ σύμπας ὁ κόσμος ἱερὸν ἀξιόχρεων ἂν γένοιτο πρὸς τὴν τούτου τιμὴν—, ἀλλὰ δι' ἐπαίνων καὶ ὕμνων, οὐχ οὐς ἡ γεγωνὸς ἄσεται φωνῆς, ἀλλὰ οὐς ὁ αἰδὴς καὶ καθαρώτατος νοῦς ἐπηχρήσει καὶ ἀναμέλῃ. Auch bei Philo hat diese Auffassung nicht zur Vernachlässigung der materiellen Opfer geführt²⁰, wohl jedoch zu einer starken Relativierung und Herabsetzung als Mittel zum Verkehr mit Gott. Obwohl also Josephus in vielem mit Philo übereinstimmt, hat er ihn nicht abgeschrieben. Seine Auffassung ist in eigenständiger Weise formuliert, und vor allem seine Argumentation, in der die Stimme so hoch gelobt, die Taten dagegen herabgesetzt werden, ist besonders auffallend. Die Opfer sind bei Josephus nicht spiritualisiert, sondern in ihrem Wert als Dankesgabe herabgewürdigt. An ihre Stelle tritt das gesprochene Gebet. Josephus und Philo stehen mit diesen Überlegungen im Rahmen des Diasporajudentums. Wir haben deutlich gesehen, daß Josephus von der Überzeugung der Griechen ausgeht, daß eine Wohltat mit einer Gegengabe beantwortet werden muß. Auf dem Boden dieses Grundsatzes werden die materiellen Gaben als ungenügend abgewiesen, auch wenn die Opfer noch dargebracht werden sollen—aber Hymnen und Gebete sind die eigentlich angemessenen Dankesgaben. Josephus und Philo stehen in Verbindung mit der Entwicklung der griechischen Religionsphilosophie, die schließlich zum wortlosen Gebet geführt hat²¹.

19 A. Schlatter, a.a.O. S. 115.

20 H. Conzelmann, in: ThW IX (1971), S. 400 mit Literaturverweisen.

21 Die Entwicklung wurde kurz skizziert von J. Kroll, *Die Lehren des Hermes Trismegistos*, Münster/Westf. 1914, S. 328ff.

Josephus hat seine Auffassung in Form einer Ansprache an Gott vorgelegt, wie das des öfteren in der Gebetspraxis geschehen ist und geschieht. In den Worten Salomos in 1 Kön 8,23f. hat er den Dank des Königs für Gottes Wohltaten gelesen. Deshalb hat er im Anschluß an die griechische Sitte, die Philo auch für das hellenistische Judentum bezeugt, eine Eucharistie²² formuliert, mit der ein rechtes Gebet anzufangen hatte. Dabei hat er auch ausgesprochen, worin eine rechte Eucharistie besteht.

Unser Historiker ist hier deutlich abhängig von populären Gedanken seiner Zeit. Es läßt sich nicht entscheiden, ob er sie direkt aus der philosophischen Tradition übernommen oder durch die Vermittlung der hellenistischen Synagoge kennengelernt hat. Das letztere scheint mir im Licht der Verwandtschaft mit Philo wahrscheinlicher, zumal mir anderswo in der Zeit vor den jüdischen Philosophen eine derartige Reflexion über die wahre Eucharistie noch nicht begegnet ist (die *Hermetica* sind später). Jedenfalls hat Josephus die Sache selbständig verarbeitet und bewußt an dieser Stelle aufgenommen.

Wegen der bei genauer Interpretation dieses Textes sich zeigenden Stellungnahme des Josephus zur Frage des Dankgebets schien mir die Behandlung dieses Abschnittes lohnend zu sein. Das Ergebnis ist m.E. auch liturgiegeschichtlich wichtig, weil es mit einem klaren, deutlich fixierbaren Testimonium unsere Kenntnisse über die Auffassung vom Gebet im ersten Jahrhundert n. Chr. bereichert.

22 Darüber P. Schubert, *Form and Function*, a.a.O. S. jetzt auch die Monographie von J. Laporte, *La doctrine eucharistique chez Philon d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1972.

Josephus' Account of the Story of Israel's Sin with Alien Women in the Country of Midian (Num. 25:1ff.)

It is my special privilege to give a contribution to this 'Festschrift' for my friend of long-standing Martien Beek, because it offers an opportunity to render him in public a small token of my gratitude and to pay my tribute to him for his wide-ranging and stimulating scholarship, particularly in the field of Jewish studies.

We met for the first time forty-six years ago in September 1928, when we both enrolled as students of the theological faculty of Leyden University. In that year we were both admitted in that renowned society of theological students 'Quisque Suis Viribus' and became friends for life. Already at that time he had an enviable gift of speech; he loved to tell a good story with a characteristic tone of humour, mingled with a bit of irony. His interests were broad, notwithstanding an early predilection for Old Testament. Martien was attracted by that singular O.T. scholar B.D. Eerdmans, a man of completely independent views in his field of study, but also of a deep piety, much akin to the sages who speak in the wisdom-literature.

Since our student-days our lives have developed along different lines, but the links, once made, remained unshaken and unbroken. We served our church in different parts of the country and since World War II in different universities, but neither geographical distance nor lapse of time has thrown a damper over our friendship.

For many years we had a close and fine cooperation in a committee of the Dutch Bible Society, preparing a New translation of the Apocrypha.

He lives in the world of the Old Testament, loves its fine stories, its pious wisdom, its prophetic visions. But not only that, the whole tragic-colourful history of the Jewish people from the days of Abraham to the present time, in *Erets Jisrael* and the Diaspora has enthralled him and makes him eloquent. He understands the spiritual depth of the Jewish adoration of the Eternal One—blessed be He—and of the Jewish 'gein'.

I have always admired my friend for the magnificent way in which he can sketch the problems, highlight the salient points, show the bearing of new discoveries on disputed passages, and always brings out the message of Law, Prophets and Writings.

In that respect the greatest achievement among Beeks many-sided publications has been, I think, his book 'Wegen en Voetsporen van het Oude

Testament',¹ the basis of which were broadcast-lectures in which he very successfully familiarized a wider public with the contents of the Old Testament.

The task my dear friend had set himself in the 20th century was similar to that which Flavius Josephus tried to accomplish at the end of the first century A.D., when he wrote his 'Jewish Antiquities'. But the circumstances in which the Jew from priestly descent did his work were quite different from those of a Dutch Christian professor. Josephus wished to make known the history of his people in order to exonerate it from all blame, with an apologetic purpose. For many reasons it is very interesting to examine this much neglected part of Josephus' extensive writings most carefully.² In this paper I wish to make a contribution in that direction by exploring the ways in which Josephus has handled a particular passage of the Old Testament, namely the story of Israel's sin with alien women in the country of Midian³ (Num. 25:1ff).

After the long narrative of the Mesopotamian seer Balaam, who was called to curse Israel, but instead gave most glorious blessings over that people (Num. 22–24), there follows in the Old Testament—without transition or connection—a story about how the Israelites dwelling in Shittim 'began to play the harlot with the daughters of Moab';⁴ at their invitation Israel sacrifices to the pagan Gods' and yoked himself to Ba'al of Pe'or'. God's wrath was kindled against the people and Moses was ordered to hang all sinners (Num. 25:1–5). The next section tells us, how an as yet unnamed Israelite brought a pagan woman to his family quite openly and how that man and wife were killed by Phinees who was praised for that deed by God, 'because he was jealous for his God' while others die by the plague (Num. 25:6–13). Then the names of the Israelite and the Midianite woman are mentioned (vss. 14–15) and Moses is ordered to smite the Midianites 'for they have harassed you with their wives' (vs. 16).

Since we deal with the work of Josephus we may leave aside all problems of exegesis and composition of the original pericope. If we then compare Josephus' rendering of that story in his 'Antiquitates Judaicae', we are immediately struck by the fact that he has paid much attention to that incident and has

1 M.A. Beek, *Wegen en voetsporen van het Oude Testament*,⁶ Amsterdam-Driebergen 1969.

2 As I have shown in my *Delitzsch-Vorlesungen*, Münster in Westfalen, December 1972 (in course of publication).

3 So according to Josephus (§126ff.), who does not speak of the Moabites, except in passing §130; cf. also Num. 25:14s.

4 The quotations from the Bible are taken from the Revised Standard Version.

greatly enlarged it (*A.J.* IV 6,6–12, §126–151), 7 pages text in the Loeb-edition.⁵ He has rearranged the material in this manner that he grouped together the paraphrase of Num. 25:1–5 and 14–15 (126–151) and has it followed by the valiant deed of Phinees, as an explanation how Zambrias⁶ came to an end⁷ (Num. 25:6–13 = Josephus, §152–155).

The limits set to this contribution do not allow a proper discussion of the Phinees-episode, because that would lead us into an evaluation of its many parallels in later Jewish tradition⁸ and require too much space. The way in which Josephus framed his narrative enables us to make a distinction between the two parts and to treat them separately. For the present moment we concentrate our attention on the former part.

But before doing so it is worthwhile to notice, that whereas in the O.T. the two parts are of almost equal length, the situation in Josephus is quite different: 6 pages of text in the Loeb-edition as against 1! In other words: the Phinees-episode is retold, but not expanded at great length, but the story of the harlotry with the Midianite woman enjoyed a good deal of extension under the hands of Josephus. This difference makes us aware of the fact that our Jewish historian must have attached great weight to that occurrence. This conclusion is confirmed by two more observations, which are made on closer examination of Josephus' account.

In the first place we notice a most striking fact, viz. that the main substance of this section consists of no less than four speeches, three of which are in the *oratio recta* (§127–130 of Balaam; §134–138 of the Midianite women; §145–149 of Zambrias) and one in the *oratio obliqua* (§143–144 of Moses).

None of the speeches has a foundation in the old Testament, although one of them, as we shall see presently, might have been suggested by later Jewish tradition. In how far the same holds true in the other cases, the available evidence is insufficient to decide. At any rate Josephus did insert these four speeches in his narrative and used them to underline the dramatic tension of the events.

5 For the text and translation of Josephus' works I use the edition of H. St. J. Thackeray R. Marcus, in the: Loeb Classical Library.

6 He is called 'Zimri' in the Old Testament, but 'Zambrias' by Josephus; because we discuss Josephus' treatment of the story in this paper, we follow his nomenclature.

7 See Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* IV 6,12, §151: 'and this wicked assault might have gone to further lengths, had not Zambrias promptly come to his end under the following circumstances'.

8 Philo mentions the Phinees-episode in many places, see J.A. Morin, *Les deux derniers des Douze*, in: *Revue Biblique* LXXX (1973), 341; see also the references to rabbinic sources in L. Ginsberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, Philadelphia 1928, vol. vi, 137f. and K.G. Kuhn, *Der tannaitische Midrasch Sifre zu Numeri*, Stuttgart 1959, 519, Ak. 113.

It would be highly important to investigate this element in Josephus' literary devices, how on the one hand he has some of his *dramatic personae* deliver speeches, while on the other hand speeches and dialogues in his sources are summarized in short statements. This subject must be postponed to a later occasion and can only be discussed properly in relation with that famous topic: Speeches in ancient historiography.⁹ But this much may be said, that when Josephus has one of his characters make a speech, it is an important moment and brings to light what according to Josephus was a great issue.

In the second place if we compare the story as told by Josephus with the same episode in other sources, we see, that there is one point of contact, but that in the main Josephus goes his own way. Philo treated that episode in his *Vita Mosis* I 294–304 which shows that he too paid much attention to it. But his treatment is rather different: in §294–299 he produces a lengthy speech of Balaam and the motives leading to it; then he shows in §300–301 a how this advice is followed and in §301b–304 he glorifies the act of Phinees who slew the brutal sinner.¹⁰ In the *Biblical Antiquities* of Pseudo Philo XVIII 13 we also find a (not very extensive) speech of Balaam and a simple statement that the Israelites were led astray, but without the story of Phinees and Zambrias. Rabbinic sources also mention the advice of Balaam and the deed of Pinees, but even if the various elements are pieced together,¹¹ the picture is completely different from that of Josephus. The words of the Midianite women, the behaviour of Moses and the audacious speech of Zambrias are not found but in Josephus.

So before making a more detailed comparison between Josephus' account and these parallels, we can, I think, draw the conclusion that we discover the

9 In order to save space we only refer to the well-known paper of M. Dibelius, *Die Reden der Apostelgeschichte und die antike Geschichtsschreibung*, in his *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte*, herausgegeben von H. Greeven, Göttingen 1951, 120–162 and the literature mentioned there.

10 Philo's treatment in *De Specialibus Legibus* I 54–58 is somewhat different; it is an illustration of the leading Jewish idea: τῶν δ' ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔθνους εἴ τινες καθυφίενται τὴν τοῦ ἐνὸς τιμὴν, ὡς λιπόντες τὴν ἀναγκαιότητα τὴν τάξιν εὐσεβείας καὶ ὁσιότητος ταῖς ἀνωτάτω τιμωρίαις ὀφείλουσι κολάζεσθαι (§54)... ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐθεάσατο τινὰς ἀλλοφύλους συνόντας γυναιξὶ καὶ ἔνεκα τῶν πρὸς αὐτὰς φίλτρων ἀλογούντας μὲν τῶν πατρίων, τελοῦμένους δὲ τὰς μυθικὰς τελετάς. ἔνα τὸν ἔξαρχον καὶ ἡγεμόνα τῆς παρανομίας καταθαρροῦντα ἤδη παρεπιδείκνυσθαι δημοσίᾳ τὸ ἀνοσιούργημα καὶ θυσίας ἀγάλμασι καὶ ξοάνοις ἀθύτους φανερώς ἐπιτελοῦντα... ἐνθουσιῶν, ἀνείρξας τοὺς παρ' ἑκάτερα ἐπὶ τὴν θέαν ἡθροισμένους, οὐδὲν εὐλαβηθεὶς ἀναίρει σὺν τῇ γυναικί, τὸν μὲν ἔνεκα τῆς εὐμαθείας τῶν ἁ λυσιτελεῖς ἀπομανθάνειν, τὴν δ' ὅτι διδάσκαλος κακῶν ἐγένετο (§56).

11 As is done by L. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, Philadelphia 1911, vol. iii, 380–386.

hand and the voice of Josephus himself in this historical description and that this passage largely reflects the ideas of this historian.

And since Josephus like other historians in antiquity¹² wrote to convey a message,¹³ we may find by a careful analysis of this passage what lesson he offers to his contemporaries.

The first part of Josephus' story, dealing with the advice of Balaam, has its parallels, as was pointed out before, in Jewish writings.¹⁴ This tradition was apparently so wide-spread, that it was also known among the Christians in Asia Minor, *teste Apocalypse 2:14* in the letter to Pergamum: 'you have some there who hold the teaching of Balaam, who taught Balak to put a stumbling block before the sons of Israel, that they might eat food sacrificed to idols and practice immorality'. The account of Num. 25:iff. does not say a word about such a counsel of Balaam, but the basis in Scripture lies, as various scholars aptly remarked,¹⁵ in Num. 31:16: 'Behold, these (women of Midian) caused the people of Israel, by the counsel of Balaam, to act treacherously against the Lord'.

What were the contents of this counsel according to Josephus? He tells us that Balak, disappointed by Balaam who had blessed Israel instead of cursing it, dismissed the prophet without reward. On his way home Balaam sent word to the king and rulers of Midian. In a clear and extensive statement he expresses his conviction that it will be impossible for them to subdue Israel, 'for God is watching over them¹⁶ to preserve them from all ill and to suffer no such calamity to come upon them as would destroy them all'; even if misfortunes befall

12 See e.g. P. Scheller, *De hellenisticae historiae conscribendae arte*, Leipzig 1911, 72–78: de fine atque usu historiae.

13 See Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* I 1,3, §14: 'the main lesson to be learnt from this history by any who care to peruse it is that men who conform to the will of God, and do not venture to transgress laws that have been excellently laid down, prosper in all things beyond belief, and for their reward are offered by God felicity; whereas, in proportion as they depart from the strict observance of these laws . . . whatever imaginary good thing they strive to do ends in irretrievable disasters.'

14 S. Rappaport, *Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus*, Wien 1930, 38, Ak. 160.

15 Thackeray in his note *i.L.*, vol. i, 538, nt. b-539; G. Badt in his German translation of Philo, *De Vita Mosis*, in: L. Cohn (Hrg.), *Die Werke Philos von Alexandria*, Breslau 1909, Bd. I, 288, Ak. 1; R. Arnoldez – C. Montdésert – J. Pouilloux – P. Savinel, *De Vita Mosis*, I–II, in: *Les oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie*, vol. 22, Paris 1967, 168, nt. 1; M.R. James, *the Biblical Antiquities of Philo* (reissue), New York 1971, 126.

16 Josephus writes in §128: πρόνοια γάρ ἐστὶν αὐτῶν τῷ θεῷ σώζειν ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ καὶ μηδὲν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἐάσαι τοιοῦτον πάθος ἐλθεῖν, ὅφ' οὐ κἂν ἀπόλοιτο πάντες—Cf. my remarks about the use of *Pronoia* in Josephus: *An Attack on the Epicureans by Flavius Josephus*, in: W. den Boer – P.G. van der Nat – C.M.J. Sicking – J.C.M. van Winden (edd.), *Romanitas et Christianitas, Studia Iano Henrico Waszink . . . oblata*, Amsterdam 1973, 349–350.

them, that will only be for a short time and thereafter they will ‘flourish once more to the terror of those who inflicted these injuries upon them’ (§127–128). This is a most remarkable profession of faith in the everlasting existence of Israel,¹⁷ penned down some twenty years after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D.! Must it not have sounded a note of warning to the Roman readers?

After this introduction follows Balaam’s advice (§129–130); he sees a possibility for short—term victory: the Midianites must send out their comeliest girls in order to make the Israelite boys lose their heads over them; the girls should lay down one condition for sexual intercourse; viz. that their lovers ‘renounce the laws of their fathers and the God to whom they owe them, and to worship the gods of the Midianites and Moabites’ (πρὶν ἂν πείσωσιν αὐτοὺς ἀφέντας τοὺς πατέριους νόμους καὶ τὸν τούτους αὐτοῖς θέμενον τιμᾶν θεὸν τοὺς Μαδιανιτῶν καὶ Μωαβιτῶν σέβωσιν).¹⁸

Philo’s account, while showing some parallels, is nevertheless different. He too points out that king Balak is cross with Bileam, as he expresses in so many words, and wants to send him away. In a private interview with the king the prophet says that after the previous inspired words he has an advice of his own making to give (*De Vita Mosis* I 292–294). Then Philo exhorts his audience to see, how clever this advice was to overwhelm them that could be always victorious (§295 πρὸς ὁμολογουμένην ἦτταν τῶν αἰεὶ νικᾶν δυναμένων), for Balaam knew that there was only one way to capture Israel, viz. licentiousness leading to impiety (§295 διὰ λαγνείας καὶ ἀκολασίας, μεγάλου κακοῦ, πρὸς μείζον κακόν, ἀσεβείαν, ἄγειν αὐτοὺς ἐσπούδασεν ἡδονὴν δέλεαρ προθεῖς). This is set forth in a speech of Balaam; he praises the beauty of the Midianite women and points out that nothing captivates a man so much as lust for women; the girls should provoke the Israelites, but not give themselves before the boys have given up their religion and sacrificed to the idols of wood and stone (§298: πρὶν ἂν ἐκδαιτηθῇς μὲν τὰ πάτρια, μεταβαλὼν δε τιμῆς ἅπερ ἐγώ. πίστις δέ μοι τῆς βεβαίου μεταβολῆς γένοιτ’ ἂν ἀρίδης ἦν ἐθελήσης μετασχεῖν τῶν αὐτῶν σπονδῶν τε καὶ θυσιῶν, ὥς ἀγάλασιν καὶ ξοάνοις καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀφιδρύμασιν ἐπιτελοῦμεν).¹⁹

The man, ‘slave of his passion’, will certainly obey. The description of Pseudo Philo, *Antiq. Bibl.* XVIII 13 is much shorter. According to this author Balak says

17 Thackeray, *l.c.* 538, nt. a referred to *Is.* 57:17 LXX and the concluding portion of the Epistle of Baruch (4:29ss).

18 The Greek phrases are given here and in subsequent pages because the catchwords are important; here may be underlined the words ἀφέντας τοὺς πατέριους νόμους—the law-giver—τοὺς Μαδιανιτῶν καὶ Μωαβιτῶν σέβωσιν.

19 Compare also the quotation from Philo, *De Spec. Leg.* I 56 on p. 244 nt. 10 with its agreement and differences.

to Balaam: 'Thy God has defrauded thee of many gifts from me', whereupon Balaam *sponte sua* gives his advice to have the comeliest women of Midian, naked and adorned with gold and jewels be shown to the Israelites, who immediately fall into their snares; 'they will sin against their Lord and fall into your hands, for otherwise thou canst not subdue them'. Balaam goes home and Balak follows his advice, so that Israel is led astray. The version of the story in *rabbinic sources*²⁰ is different.

Balaam starts by saying that the God of Israel loathes unchastity, but the Israelites are very eager to possess linen garments.²¹ The Moabites pitch a great number of tents and put two harlots, an older and a younger one, to bring the Israelites who want to buy the linen garments inside. There they are intoxicated by wine and 'his passion for the woman was soon kindled, but she agreed to satisfy his desires only after he had first worshipped Peor, the god of the Moabites²² and abjured the law of Moses'. In *TB. Sanhedrin* fol. 106a the story ends with a reference to Hosea 9:10 'They come to Ba'alpe'or and consecrated themselves to shame, and became detestable like the king they loved'. Unchastity leads to idolatry.

A comparison of these different versions brings to light, how this story of Num. 25 has captivated the minds of these Jews in the 1st and later centuries. They have all in common the theme that by way of unchastity Israel is led to idolatry and hence to sin. It was the seer Balaam who showed this disastrous way. Remarkable is the trait of the condition laid down by the women. But although there are various parallel features, one cannot say that one version is dependant on the other; in each source we find a special form of this 'midrash'.

It is particularly instructive to study the version of Philo and Josephus parallel. They differ already at the very beginning about the time, place and addressees of Balaam's advice.

Philo's account has a more psychological touch, and gives more stress to the evil of lust. That fact can easily be understood, if we keep in mind that 'De Vita Mosis' is not a historical book in the sense of Josephus, but philosophy

20 See H.L. Strack – P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München 1926, Bd. III, 793 und L. Ginzberg, *Legends*, vol. iii, 380–382 and the notes in vol. vi.

21 The source of this statement is unclear.

22 Pe'or is derived from the verb פָּעַר = to go to stool, see G.H. Dalman, *Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch*², Frankfurt a. Main 1922, 342, s.v. and Billerbeck, *a.a.O.*, 793.

in historical dress, and that Philo loves psychologizing.²³ Each author had a different audience in view. On the other hand it should be noted that both writers see 'the ancestral laws' at stake and whereas Philo uses terminology of conversion to idolatry, Josephus speaks of apostasy from the one God the Lawgiver to the many gods. By this comparison Josephus' outspoken confession in the invincibility of Israel to which we have drawn attention at an earlier stage is also highlighted.

The next section of Josephus' account tells us in a graphic way, how the Midianite maidens fulfil their 'task' and play their game with the captivated Hebrew boys (§131–133). Josephus goes on not by describing, how the women succeed in making the Israelites comply with their wishes. No, he inserts a long speech of these damsels (§134–138).

The Hebrews have promised to make them mistresses of their possessions, but in reply the ladies say that they were not in quest of that, when they sought the company of these men. They wanted to become their wives, but fear that after some time they will be sent away dishonoured.²⁴ For that reason they want a clear proof of the abiding affection of the Israelites. This passage is so important that it should be quoted literally: 'Seeing then . . . that ye have customs and a mode of life wholly alien to all mankind, insomuch that your food is of a peculiar sort and your drink is distinct from that of other man, it behoves you, if ye would live with us, also to revere our Gods . . . that ye worship the same gods as we. Nor can any man reproach you for venerating the gods of the special country whereto you are come, above all when our gods are common to all mankind, while yours has no other worshipper'. To this is added a summary of their argument: 'They must therefore (they added) either fall in with the beliefs of all man or look for another world, where they could live alone in accordance with their peculiar laws'.²⁵

23 Philo, *De Vita Mosis* I §300 says that the king found this an excellent plan and abolished the law against adultery and prostitution and allowed the women to have intercourse with everyone with impunity. Nothing of such a measure is found in Josephus; in his account the maidens are just sent out according to Balaam's advice. This touch in Philo is very remarkable. Is it because in his time the '*Lex Julia de adulteris*' of Augustus, 18 B.C. (see Th. Mayer-Maly, *Adulterium*, in: K. Ziegler – W. Sontheimer, *Der Kleine Pauly, Lexikon der Antike*, Stuttgart 1964, Bd. I, Sp. 79) was still in force?

24 See also Josephus' account in *Ant. Jud.* xi 5,3–4, §140–153 about the marriages with foreign wives in the days of Ezra (*Ezra* 9–10); these ladies were sent away without more ado, because the man who had married them, lived in great sin.

25 We give again (see p. 246, nt. 18) the characteristic Greek terms of §137–138: τοῖς δ' ἔθεσι καὶ τῷ βίῳ πρὸς ἅπαντας ἀλλοτριώτατα χρῆσθε, ὡς καὶ τὰς τροφὰς ὑμῖν ἰδιοτρόπους εἶναι καὶ τὰ

Thackeray claimed that 'the model for this speech and for the episode as a whole was furnished by a similar story of the Scythians and the Amazons in Herodotus iv.114ff'.²⁶ In particular he calls attention to the words in §134: ἡμῖν . . . οἱκοί τέ εἰσι πατρῷοι καὶ κτήσις ἀγαθῶν ἄφθονος and Herodotus iv 114: ἡμῖν εἰσὶ μὲν τοκέες εἰσὶ δὲ κτήσεις.

But is this apparent similarity indeed a parallel? The words in Herodotus are spoken by the Scythian boys to tempt the Amazons to marry them for the gain of these goods, whereas the Midianite women declare that they have plenty of possessions and do not want to marry for their sake. So the words have a completely opposite tendency. It would take too much space, if we were to make a full comparison of the two passages involved. Suffice it to say that in Herodotus the Scythians invite the Amazones to live among them, but these warfaring ladies reject that, because their habits are completely different from those of the Scythian women; therefore they make the proposition that the Scythian boys should share their lives; and so they did. If we put these two stories side by side there is hardly any point of agreement and we must conclude that the suggestion of Thackeray is completely wrong, yet another illustration of taking superficial similarities for parallelism and influence.

The only gain we can get from this comparison is the fact that we see more clearly the special features in Josephus' speech: the Jews have customs different from those of the rest of the world; marriage is only possible on condition of worshipping the gods of the heathen. In this connection it is important to observe that Josephus does not mention Baal Peor, but speaks of the gods in general.

We do not hear in these words an echo of the voice of Herodotus, but of charges made in the Hellenistic and Roman periods against the Jews.

Some relevant testimonies may be quoted:²⁷ *Esther* 3:8 the accusation of Haman οἱ δὲ νόμοι αὐτῶν (sc. the Jews) ἑξάλλοι παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη which is

ποτὰ μὴ κοινὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις . . . ἡμῖν συνοικεῖν καὶ θεοὺς τοὺς ἡμετέρους σέβειν—τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἡμῖν θεοὺς προσκυνεῖν—εἰ γῆς εἰς ἣν ἀφίχθε τοὺς ἰδίους αὐτῆς προστρέποισθε, καὶ ταῦτα τῶν μὲν ἡμετέρων κοινῶν ὄντων πρὸς ἅπαντας, τοῦ δ' ἡμετέρου πρὸς μηδὲνα τοιοῦτου τυγχάνοντες.

26 Thackeray, *l.c.*, 540 nt. a–541; also in his 'Introduction' to this vol. I, viz. p. xv, nt. (i) where this text is mentioned together with other features of 'dependence on classical authors'.

27 E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*⁴, Leipzig 1909, Bd. III, 547–553; the texts have been collected by Th. Reinach, *Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au Judaïsme*, Paris 1895.

paraphrased by Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* XI 6,5, §212 as follows: ἄμικτον, ἀσύμφυλον οὔτε θρησκείαν τὴν αὐτὴν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἔχον οὔτε νόμοις χρώμενον ὁμοίοις, ἔχθρον δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἔθεσι καὶ τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν τῷ σῶ καὶ ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις.

Didorus Siculus XXXIV fr.1²⁸ the 'friends' of King Antiochus VII Sidetes want him to destroy the Jewish nation μόνους γὰρ ἀπάντων ἔθνων ἀκοινωνήτους εἶναι τῆς πρὸς ἄλλα ἔθνος ἐπιμιξίας.

Posidonius and Molon, ap. Josephus, *c. Apionem* II 7, §79: accusant quidam nos, quare nos eosdem deos cum aliis non colimus.

Molon, ap. Josephus, *c. Apionem* II 36, §258... μῆδε κοινωνεῖν ἐθέλομεν τοῖς καθ' ἑτέραν συνήθειαν βίου ζῆν προαιρουμένοις. Apion, ap. Josephus, *c. Apionem* II 10, §121 the Jews swear an oath μηδενὶ εὐνοήσιν ἄλλοφύλῳ.

Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii Tyan.* V 33: οἱ γὰρ βίον ἄμικτον εὐρόντες καὶ οἷς μῆτε κοινὴ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους τράπεζα μῆτε σπονδαὶ μῆτ' εὐχαὶ μῆτε θυσίαι.

The keywords of these objections return in the speech of the Midianite women with some variation. In a world in which the idea of the unity of mankind was widespread, particularly under Stoic influence, the Jews with their peculiar habits formed a miserable exception.²⁹ In a world which accepted the plurality of Gods and respected the variety of cults in different countries (n.b. the interesting remark: 'nor can any man reproach you for venerating the gods of the special country whereto you are come!'),³⁰ the strict monotheism of the Jews with its condemnation of idolatry was a ridiculous obstacle for social intercourse. This attitude was the reason, why the Jews were called 'atheists and haters of mankind'.³¹

In the light of these charges the last sentence of this section is very telling: ἢ ταῦτά πάσιν ἡγγατέον ἢ ζητεῖν ἄλλην οἰκουμένην (sic!), ἐν ᾗ βιώσονται μόνοι κατὰ

28 Reinach, *Lc.*, 56 gives this text under the name of the philosopher Posidonius, though admitting in footnote 1 that his name is not mentioned. It is not inserted L. Edelstein – I.G. Kidd, *Posidonius*, vol. I *the Fragments*, Cambridge 1972.

29 This idea has been treated by M. Mühl, *Die antike Menschheitsidee in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Leipzig 1928.

30 This veneration is a sure proof of their loyalty, cf. §135 πίστιν εὐνοίας and §137 τεκμήριον ἧς ἔχουν τε νῦν φατε πρὸς ἡμᾶς εὐνοίας... τὸ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἡμῖν θεοὺς προσκυνεῖν. It is also mentioned in Philo, *De Vita Mosis* I 298 (see the quotation on p. 247); cf. also Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* VII 3,3, §50 of a Jewish apostate: περὶ μὲν τῆς αὐτοῦ μεταβολῆς, καὶ τοῦ μεμισηκέναι τὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνη τεκμήριον ἐμπαρέχειν οἰόμενος τὸ ἐπιθύειν, ὥσπερ νόμος ἐστὶ τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν.

31 See the statement of Molon, quoted before in the text, and Tacitus, *Historia* V 5: 'adversus omnes alios hostile odium. Separati epulis, discreti cubilibus... alienarum concubitu abstinent'; and about Jewish proselytes: contemnere deos, exuere patriam, parentes, liberos, fratres, vilia habere'.

τοὺς ἰδίους νόμους. With these words Josephus has formulated the decisive alternative for the Jews in the 'Oecumene'.

Now the story has reached a critical point: what are the enamoured boys going to do? In the next paragraphs §139–141 we are told, how they yield to this temptation, yea even 'some of the leading men persons conspicuous through the virtues of their ancestors'.³² One of these noblemen was Zambrias, the leader of the tribe Simeon, who 'in preference to the decrees of Moses, devoted himself to the cult that would be to her liking' (§141).³³ We may put together the key-words: παρέβησαν τὰ πάτρια θεοῦς τε πλείονας εἶναι νομίσαντες (polytheism!) καὶ θύειν αὐτοῖς κατὰ νόμον τὸν ἐπιχώριον—ξενικοῖς τε βρώμασιν (unclean food) ἔχαιρον—'and to please these women, ceased not to do everything contrary to that which their Law ordained'.³⁴ These last words remind us of another event in Israel's history, the fall of king Solomon (1 Kings 11). Josephus gives this paraphrase which offers striking parallels to our passage, in *Ant. Jud.* VIII 7,5, §190–192: Solomon did remain faithful to God until the end of his life καταλιπὼν τὴν τῶν πατρῶν ἐθισμῶν φυλακὴν . . . he was mad of women and took many both of this own people and aliens; παρέβη μὲν τοὺς Μωυσέος νόμους, ὃς ἀπηγόρευσε συνοικεῖν ταῖς οὐχ ὁμοφύλοις, τοὺς δ' ἐκείνων ἤρξατο θρησκεύειν θεοῦς to please these wives and his own passion—'which is the very thing the law-giver foresaw when he warned the Hebrews against marrying women of other countries', ἵνα μὴ τοῖς ξένοις ἐπιπλακέντες ἔθουσι τῶν πατρῶν ἀποστῶσι, μηδὲ τοὺς ἐκείνων σέβωνται θεοὺς παρέντες τιμᾶν τὸν ἴδιον. The similarity in terminology is most remarkable. Great stress is laid upon the fact that this is a transgression of the Mosaic Law, the specific Law of the Jews that had strongly warned against such practices.³⁵

32 This feature is taken by Josephus from Num. 25:4, as Thackeray, *L.c.*, 545 in *margin* indicated.

33 For the words τὸ πρὸς ἡδονὴν αὐτῇ γενησόμενον see below in the text.

34 Greek text: καὶ πάντ' εἰς ἡδονὴν τῶν γυναικῶν ἐπὶ τοῦναντίον οἷς ὁ νόμος αὐτῶν ἐκέλευε ποιοῦντες διέτελουν.

35 The law against marriage with women of pagan nations in Exod. 34:16 and Deut. 7:3 is quoted in 1 Kings 11:2. In all these texts specific Canaanite groups are mentioned, but both Philo, *De Spec. Leg.* III 29 and Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* VIII 7,5, §191 apply this rule in general to all pagan nations (see the note of I. Heinemann, in: *Die Werke Philos*², Berlin 1962, Bd. II, 191, Ak. 1).—In Deut. 7:4 the danger of idolatry is specifically named: 'For they would turn away your sons from following me, to serve other gods', and Philo, *L.c.*: ἴσως γὰρ δελεασθέντες νόθοις πρὸ γνησίων ἔθουσι κινδυνεύουσι τὴν τοῦ ἑνὸς θεοῦ τιμὴν ἀπομαθεῖν, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος τῆς ἀνωτάτω βαρυνδαίμονιας.

In the final part of this passage Josephus underscores twice over the danger that is immanent. It is not the personal danger of immorality, but 'of complete ruin of their own institution' (κίνδυνον παντελῶς τῶν ἰδίων ἐθισμῶν ἀπολείας. ἅπαξ γὰρ τὸ νέον γευσάμενον ξενικῶν ἐθισμῶν ἀπλήστως ἐνεφορεῖτο).³⁶

Yet another word calls for comment here: 'a sedition (στάσιν) far greater than the last'. This refers back to the revolution of Korah and his company which Josephus has recorded in *Ant. Jud.* IV 2,1ff., §11ff. The strong words of our historian in the introduction of his account are worth quoting: 'Thus it was a sedition, for which we know of no parallel whether among Greeks or barbarians, broke out among them; this sedition brought them all into peril of destruction' (§12). But the present case even surpasses those previous events. It is very significant that Josephus uses the word *stasis* here which for ages was the term for ruin threatening the welfare of the state in Greek political thinking.³⁷

Events have now developed to a new dramatic culminating point: what at first was a possibility has now become an open fact; now the ruin of Israel's state stares them in the face.³⁸ What is Moses, the great leader, going to do?

It is important to recall at this stage the words of the Old Testament (Num. 25:31ff: "And the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel; and the Lord said to Moses 'Take all the chiefs of the people, and hang them in the sun before the Lord, that the fierce anger of the Lord may turn from Israel'. And Moses said to the judges of Israel, 'Every one of you slay his man who have yoked themselves to Ba'al of Pe'or". Not a single word of these verses is taken over by Josephus! This fact is the more striking, because at an earlier stage he has mentioned the wrath of God, but in a peculiar way, namely at the end of Balaam's counsel (§130).

The prophet foretells that if all goes according to his advice: οὕτως γὰρ αὐτοῖς τὸν θεὸν ὀργισθήσεται. At that stage it was still future. But now everything has

36 Has τὸ νέον here a special accent? Also in the first Epistle of Clement, a contemporary of Josephus, the *stasis* is ascribed to youthful persons who are rash, inclined to rebellion etc.

37 An important discussion of this topic in the classical time of Greece was given by D. Loenen, *Stasis, enige aspecten van de begrippe partij- en klassenstrijd in oud-Griekenland*, Amsterdam 1953; see also my studies in 1 Clement.

38 See the beginning of §142: ἐν τούτοις δ' ὄντων τῶν πραγμάτων. The meaning of these words is not simple: 'such was the state of things' (Thackeray), but: 'in such a dangerous situation were the affairs of the state' (πράγματα has often this particular notion, see H.G. Liddell – R. Scott – H. Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*⁹, Oxford 1940, 1457, s.v. III 2; for οἷτος denoting contempt, 1276 C3). It has this special connotation, because there is a *stasis* going on.

gone according to Balaam's plan. So remembering these words one may expect that at this moment the divine wrath will explode.

However, nothing of the kind happens in Josephus' description (§142–144). One wonders, why our historian has suppressed it or at least changed his story so that nothing of it is found. The reason cannot be, that Josephus did not want to speak about God's wrath, because he found it too anthropomorphic a feature, for in other places of his works he uses this expression quite freely.³⁹ Here lies a riddle which I wish to indicate without being able, even after many efforts, to solve it.⁴⁰ Or would the answer simply be that Josephus did not know what was meant by vs. 4, because this order is not executed.

However that may be, the behaviour of Moses as pictured by Josephus is completely at variance with that described in Num. 25:5. Moses does not command to kill the trespassers, but 'convened the people in assembly' (§142 συναγαγὼν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τὸν λαόν).⁴¹ This expression could be prompted by the words of Num. 25:6 LXX: ἐναντι πάσης συναγωγῆς υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ, but in any case it is often found in the works of Greek historians, particularly in the *Antiquitates Romanae* of Dionysius Halicarnassensis: many times, when there is internal strife among the Roman people they are called into an assembly, where the matter is discussed.

The curious thing in this passage is that Moses does not condemn the trespassers, that he does not pass the strongest sentence over their transgression of the Law and their idolatry, as could be expected after what is said before, but that he is so friendly, trying to win them back.⁴²

Does Josephus want to bring out in this way the character of the great leader, of Israel (cf. Num. 12:3: 'Now the man Moses was very meek, more than all man' and Josephus' encomium in *Ant. Jud.* IV 8,49, §328: εἰπεῖν τε καὶ πλήθεις ὁμιλῆσαι κεχαρισμένος τὰ τε ἄλλα καὶ τῶν παθῶν αὐτοκράτωρ, for he knew passions only by name. The leading thought of Moses' words is μετανοῆσαι (in the

39 See O. Procksch, in G. Kittel – G. Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Stuttgart 1954, Bd. V 418f.; there is a marked difference here with Philo.—The discussion of this topic in A. Schlatter, *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josephus*, Gütersloh 1932, 39 is absolutely insufficient; there are many more texts. It is impossible to make a comparison with the account in *Sifre Numeri*, see the translation of K.G. Kuhn, *a.a.O.*, 518ff.

40 In that case we should have to investigate the whole complex, also those places where it is mentioned in the Old Testament, but changed by Josephus; and such a task goes beyond the limits set to this paper.

41 Cf. also Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* IV 4,1, §63: δέσας μὴ τι νεωτερίσωσι πάλιν καὶ γένηται τι μέγα καὶ χαλεπόν, συνήγαγε τὸ πλῆθος εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

42 Cf. at the end of §144 ἐπειράτο, an *imperfectum de conatu*.

beginning of the summary of his speech; at the end εἰς μετάνοιαν ἄγειν while in the middle we find the synonym μεταβάλεσθαι). He opens a way for return: *metanoia* instead of driving them to *aponoia*. He does not openly put them to shame. The thoughts he expresses belong to the sphere of the *diatribe*,⁴³ stress being laid on lust on the one hand and their dignity on the other. He teaches them what real ἀνδρεία-courage is, a theme often discussed in ethical discourses:⁴⁴ not to violate the laws and to resist their own lusts. It is remarkable to notice that the rejection of God and His way of life is not forgotten, because that was the real issue, but gets only an almost casual reference. On the other hand the rather broad warning against the danger of luxurious circumstances is interesting. It is in flagrant contrast with a statement of Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* III 8,10, §223: the laws of God are rigidly observed 'insomuch that neither in peace through luxury, nor in war, under constraint, have Hebrews transgressed any of them'. It calls to mind Deut. 32:15 'But Jesh'urum waxed fat, and kicked . . . then he forsook God who made him' which is quoted in 1 *Clement* 3:1 also in connection with sedition.⁴⁵

In this wise way, Josephus says, Moses wanted to bring the transgressors to their senses, restore the unity in Israel and keep the people intact as God's people. What is the result of this reconciling word of warning and exhortation of the great lawgiver and leader?

At first nothing about the response of the people is said, but the tension of the story is brought to a climax by a most insolent lengthy speech of the grave sinner Zambrias (§141). Very significantly Josephus gives his words in direct speech, which stands in marked contrast to the résumé of Moses' oration in the previous section. Is this not an indication of the weight attached to these utterances by Josephus?

The address of Zambrias consists of two parts, first (§145–147) an attack on Moses' ordinances in general and second an exposition, hardly an apology, of his own behaviour (§148–149). His whole argument is built on a sharp antithesis, starting with the words σὺ μὲν . . . ἐγὼ δ'. It is a frontal attack on Moses.

It is typical that in this speech Moses is not called the 'lawgiver', though what is criticized is precisely that work of his. Only in the following description of the reaction of the people on this clash (§150) does Josephus use this word

43 The use of the verb ἐπανορθοῦν is very significant in this connection.

44 Philo in his treatise *De Virtutibus* (*De Fortitudine*) makes also use of Num. 25:1ss., but with a different application (§34ss.).

45 Already in Polybius VI 57 we find the idea that prosperity leads to *stasis*.

without explicitly naming him 'Moses', for he is the Lawgiver *par excellence*. Josephus uses this *epitheton* very frequently, ever since *Ant. Jud.* 1.1.4, §18 and so does Philo; they do so notwithstanding the fact that they know the Law being a gift of God. By this designation 'the Lawgiver' the greatness of Moses is magnified, for thereby he is put on one line with the great 'lawgivers' like Lycurgus, Solon, Numa and others on whom the various peoples in Antiquity boasted, semireligious heroes and revealers of the true religion and way-of-life.⁴⁶

But this Moses is according to Zambrias nothing but an impostor who wants "under the pretext of 'laws' and 'God' to contrive servitude for us and sovereignty for 'himself'" (§146); he has duped the simple-minded Hebrews (§145);⁴⁷ his orders are those of a tyrant⁴⁸ and he is more offensive than the Egyptians 'in claiming to punish in the name of these laws the intention of each individual to please himself, (§147). Moses himself deserved punishment and would have got it, had not the Hebrews been so stupid. Moses with his legislation runs counter to all the rest of the world: 'having purposed to abolish things which all the world has unanimously admitted to be excellent (τὰ παρ' ἐκάστοις ὁμολογούμενα καλῶς ἔχειν) and for having set up, over against universal opinion (κατὰ τῆς ἀπάντων δόξης) thine own extravagances' (§147).

In this last accusation we hear an echo of that reproach the pagans levelled against the Jews (see before p. 248ss.). It is fully appreciated, if we bear in mind that the 'argumentum e consensu omnium' as a criterion for the truth of some notion was widely held in the ancient world, also in the times of Josephus.⁴⁹ To form an exception was equal to being completely mistaken and wrong.

Another charge calls also for some comments: the slavery and tyranny Moses sets up was in 'robbing us of life's sweets and of that liberty of action, which belongs to free men who own no master' (§146 ἀφαιρούμενος ἡμᾶς τὸ ἡδὺ καὶ τὸ κατὰ τὸν βίον αὐτεξούσιον, ὁ τῶν ἐλευθέρων ἐστὶ καὶ δεσπότην οὐκ ἔχόντων). It goes without saying that the last part of this sentence calls to mind the situation of

46 The article of W. Gutbrod, νομοθέτης in G. Kittel – G. Friedrich, *Theol. Wörterbuch*, Bd. IV, 1084 is short and completely insufficient. A list of these 'lawgivers' is found in A.S. Pease, *M. Tulli, Ciceronis De Natura Deorum*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1955, 1218 with some references. This concept, particularly in Jewish-Hellenistic literature, needs further examination.

47 See also in §146 κακουργεῖς = 'by wicked artifice'.

48 §146: οἷς οὐ προστάσσεις τυραννικῶς, and it does not need saying, how despised tyrants were in Greek eyes.

49 A good discussion of this theme in R. Schian, *Untersuchungen, über das 'argumentum e consensu omnium'*, Hildesheim 1973.

free citizens over against slaves.⁵⁰ They possess the right to enjoy the sweetness of life and αὐτεξούσιον which Thackeray in a footnote translates by 'self-determination'.⁵¹ This last expression is very significant. Some Greek texts may illustrate its meaning:

Epictetus, *Diss.* IV 1,62 τί οὖν ἐστὶ τὸ ποιοῦν ἀκώλυτον τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ αὐτεξούσιον; ... IV 1,68 πότερον οὖν οὐδὲν ἔχεις αὐτεξούσιον, ὃ ἐπὶ μόνῳ ἔστι σοί, ἢ ἔχεις τι τοιοῦτον; in the next paragraph synonyms are ἀκώλυτος and ἀνεμπόδιτος, the contrast being 'to force' somebody.

Diogenianus Epic., fr. 3, ap. Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* VI 8,36 τὸ ἡμᾶς βουληθῆναι τε καὶ μὴ βουληθῆναι ὑπ' οὐδεμίας ἐτέρας αἰτίας προκατείχετο, ἀλλ' ἦν αὐτεξούσιον.

Clemens Alex., *Quis dives salvetur* 10,1 commenting on the words 'If you would be perfect' (Matth. 19:21): τὸ αὐτεξούσιον τῆς προδιαλεγόμενης αὐτῷ ψυχῆς ἐδήλωσεν. ἐπὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ γὰρ ἦν ἡ αἴρεσις ὡς ἐλευθέρῳ . . . 14,4 κριτήριον ἐλευθερον ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ καὶ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον τῆς μεταχειρίσεως τῶν δοθέντων.

But it is not always used in a philosophico-ethical context, as is shown by Diodorus Sic. XIV 105,4: contrary to all expectation he let the prisoners-of-war go αὐτεξουσίου without ransom. Herodianus VII 7,2, a hatred ἀδεῆς καὶ αὐτεξούσιον γενόμενον ἀκολύτως ἐξεχείτο.

So the word is also known to Josephus, *B.J.* V 13,5, §556: τοῖς πάθεσιν αὐτεξουσίως χρώνται—*Ant. Jud.* 7,10, §266: since no relations of Hyrcanus were left over τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτεξούσιον αὐτῷ τυγχάνειν, with ἐμποδῶν as a synonym in the next clause—*c. Apionem* I 8,37 the writing of the Holy Scriptures among the Jews was not αὐτεξουσίου πᾶσιν, but under divine inspiration.

These examples which could be easily multiplied show that the word αὐτεξούσιον means: to make a completely independent decision without being influenced or hindered by anything from outside.

But the application of this term in the context of Zambrias' speech has not only a general meaning, but a clear polemical sting as we see from another, most illuminating passage in Josephus, *c. Apionem* II 17,173 s.s., where our author sets forth the unique greatness of 'our Lawgiver' in contrast with Greek legislation. Moses is praised, because he ordered the life of his people from its earliest youth without the slightest exception: οὐδὲν οὐδὲ βραχυτάτων αὐτεξούσιον ἐπὶ ταῖς βουλήσεσι τῶν χρωμένων κατέλιπεν. There follow some examples, after

50 Cf. H. Schlier, ἐλεύθερος, in Kittel-Friedrich, *Theol. Wörterbuch*, Bd. II, 484ff.: opposite to slavery; characteristic for the citizen.—K.H. Rengstorff, δεσπότης, ibidem, 43: slave-owner.

51 Thackeray, *l.c.*, 547, n.t.a.: 'The modern word 'self-determination' closely corresponds to the Greek'.

which Josephus continues: he 'made the Law the standard and rule (ὄρον . . . καὶ κανόνα), that we might live under it as under a father and master (δεσπότη) and be guilty of no sin through wilfulness or ignorance'; weekly assemblies are prescribed 'to listen to the Law and to obtain a thorough and accurate knowledge of it'.

The connection and contrast between these two passages *c. Apionem* II 173 and *Ant. Jud.* IV 146 is most striking and important. Moses is highly praised by the Jewish apologist Josephus, because he has ordered even the minutest details of life and left nothing to man's own decision in order to prevent him from sinning, in other words: to let him live according to God's revealed will by taking away the pitfalls into which a man may fall, if he is left to his own decisions.

But exactly on this point he is criticized by Zambrias, because man becomes a slave by taking away that possibility of free decision. Here appears in a typical form the problem of heteronomy versus autonomy in ethics. It is not by coincidence, I think, that Josephus uses this selfsame, characteristically Greek word αὐτεξούσιον in both passages; it must have been a central issue in debates over the meaning of the Mosaic Law.

This rejection of the Law by Zambrias is not a theoretical discussion but he has demonstrated it by his personal behaviour, and he does not shrink back⁵² from openly showing his αὐτεξούσιον (see the last clause of his speech οὐδεις κυριώτερον αὐτὸν . . . γνώμης⁵³ τῆς ἐμῆς ἀποφαινόμενος).

He has made up his mind (§148 'after deciding that it was right') and confesses in the assembly that he has taken an alien wife⁵⁴ and sacrifices to a plurality of gods to whom sacrifices are due according to many people. His utterances reflect what is said before: a) 'I had no intention of concealment' (οὐδὲ λαθεῖν)—see Moses' plan in §142 ἐκ τοῦ λανθάνειν· b) 'as from a free man' . . . 'not to live as under a tyranny'—see his charge against Moses who wants to rob the people of its freedom and to bring it under tyranny; c) 'deeming it right to get at the truth for myself from many persons, and not . . . hanging all my hopes for my whole life upon one'—see §147 'which all the world has unanimously admitted . . . over against universal opinion thine own extravagances' (with my comments on p. 255).

52 Very typical is the use of ὀκνήσαιμι. cf. Liddell-Scott, *Lc.*, 1212, s.v.: 'In Att. mostly with collat. sense of the feeling which causes the hesitation, and so 1 of shame or fear (in a moral sense) . . . 3 most commonly of cowardice'. Here these feelings go together.

53 γνώμη = my considered opinion, my view (see Liddell-Scott, *Lc.*, 354, s.v. III).

54 N.B. γύναιον, term of endearment.

This speech of Zambrias is a most remarkable and astonishing document, for this fully-fledged, frontal attack on the Mosaic Law, the basis of Israel's existence, is, as far as I know, unique in this radical and elaborate form. It goes without saying that this attitude towards the Law is quite different from that of St. Paul, although in both cases the opposite terms 'slavery' and 'freedom from the Law' are found, because for Paul 'the Law is holy' (Rom. 7:12) whereas here the law is an instrument of Moses' tyranny. Here the voice is heard from a man 'that says that the Law is not from Heaven' (*Mishna Sanhedrin* X 1, one of the declarations of Israelites who have no share in the world to come), but was made by Moses under the pretext of God (§146).

To this declaration of the Mishna the *Talmud Jerushalmi* X (fol. 27c) adds a triple formula which is frequently found in rabbinic sources as a designation of an apostate:⁵⁵ 'he who casts off the Yoke (of the commandments), who breaks the covenant (of circumcision), who is insolent against the Law (litt. uncovers his face)'. This last expression is sometimes explained as 'making indecent jokes about certain stories in the Torah', but in *T.Jer.* x (*l.c.*) a twofold explanation is given: a) to say that the Law is not given by God; b) to trespass openly the commandments. In *S. Num.* 15,22, §111 it is also applied to idolatry.

Zambrias is a typical example, one may say: for Josephus the prototype of such an apostate, although the motives are not made so explicit in these rabbinic sources as in this passage of Josephus. The portrait drawn by Philo of the apostates may also be compared: τοὺς τῶν ἱερῶν νόμων ἀποστάντας ἰδεῖν ἔστιν ἀκολάστους, ἀναισχύντους, ἀσέμνους, ὀλιγοφρόνες, φίλαπεχθήμονας, . . . τὴν ἐλευθερίαν πεπρακότας ὄψου καὶ ἀκράτου καὶ πεμμάτων καὶ εὐμορφίας εἰς τε τὰς γαστρός ἀπολαύσεις καὶ τῶν μετὰ γαστέρα (*De Virtutibus* §182). Here the note of 'selling one's freedom' by apostasy is rather pungent in contrast with the use of 'freedom' by Zambrias, who wants to acquire his liberty by severing himself from the Law. Wolfson, in his great book on Philo has given an extensive discussion of all the texts in which the Alexandrian philosopher refers to apostates.⁵⁶ Philo also knows of apostates who say that the Law contains myths and ridiculous stories; in his experience the violence of dietary regulations and intermarriage with Gentiles play an important role in breaking away from Judaism,⁵⁷

55 An excellent discussion of this formula in K.G. Kuhn, *a.a.O.*, 794ff. and cf. my study: *The semitische achtergrond van ΠΑΡΗΣΙΑ in het Nieuwe Testament*, in: *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen*, afd. Letterkunde, N.R. xxv 11, Amsterdam 1962, 10–11. For the use of the word 'Yoke', see Billerbeck, *a.a.O.*, Bd. I, 608–610.

56 H.A. Wolfson, *Philo, foundations of religious philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, Cambridge (Mass) 1947, vol. i, 73–76.

57 See before p. 251.

But nowhere in his works do we find such an open, brutal attack which lays the axe at the roots of the whole Jewish constitution as in this speech of Zambrias.

Though the speaker was born within the Jewish fold he sets himself apart from his easily-duped compatriots and wants to be free from all the limitations, laid upon him by the Law, to make his own decisions and to follow the ideas of the majority of men⁵⁸ and not to live in a minority position. It is not possible to detect in his words the influence of a particular greek philosophical school. It may be said that individual man is central and all-deciding, a thought that calls to mind the adagium of the sophist Protagoras: that man is the measure of all things. The idea of the *consensus* was very wide-spread.⁵⁹

Zambrias' break with Judaism is not a gradual one; he does not fall from bad to worse to end in a complete renunciation of the old religion. But he rejects it from the outset, because he wishes to be independent and not to live in that exceptional position, belonging to a minority-group.

It is hardly conceivable that the words of this remarkable speech arose out of Josephus' own imagination. They are the expression of what was thought by his contemporaries who broke away from the ancestral religion and gave their reasons for doing so.

Indeed, we can understand now, why Josephus declared, that this revolution was even greater than the previous one (see p. 252): the sedition of Korah c.s. was directed against the leadership of men, Moses and Aaron, but this one cut at the roots of the whole Jewish existence. In the next section (§150–151) Josephus describes the result of this dramatic clash. Curiously enough, there is no uproar for or against Moses; although Zambrias is the spokesman of some others, the people as a whole in this assembly 'held their peace';⁶⁰ nobody else expresses his opinion, all wait in silence, 'in terror of what might come', recalling, no doubt what had happened at the former occasion (cf. §52: 'furnishing an exhibition of God's mighty power'). Moses himself realizes that further debate is useless, may even lead to a wider spread of these pernicious ideas and to upsetting the crowd. So he dissolves the meeting. This might not have

58 Cf. 1 Samuel 8:5ff. 'like all the nations—forsaking me and serving other gods'.

59 See the reference on p. 255, nt. 49.

60 See on this word W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*⁵, Berlin 1958, Sp. 690, s.v.—cf. Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* I 21,1, §339: οἱ μὲν πλείους ἡσύχαζον γνώμης ἀποροῦντες of the sons of Jacob who held a council after the rape of Dinah and the proposal of Emor (interesting in this connection the sentence of §238: οὐτε νόμιμον ἡγούμενος ἀλλοφύλῳ συνοικίζειν τὴν θυγατέρα).

put a stop to the whole shocking affair, had not Zambrias got what he deserved through the intervention of Phinees who killed Zambrias and his mistress and set an example to others to murder the transgressors.

This brings the events to a close. As we pointed out before (see p. 243), it would take us too far to discuss Josephus' account of this final scene in its relation to the accounts in other sources of the Hellenistic Roman period.

One question, however, is still left unanswered and may not be left in that stage, viz. why Josephus changed the Old Testament 'Vorlage' the way he did and what was the 'message' he wished to convey (see p. 245).

In contrast with other places in his works, in which Josephus gives a clear indication of the lesson which can be drawn from a certain part of Scripture,⁶¹ we do not find anything of the kind in the passage under discussion. So our answer can only be hypothetical and should eventually be placed in the framework of a much wider investigation of many more passages to reach a final conclusion. And yet the remodelling of the story in *Num.* 25 is too extensive and too marked not to attract our attention. Though Josephus has not spelled out the lesson *expressis verbis* he has given sufficient pointers to grasp his mind.

Curiously enough, he left out names like Shittim, and Ba'al Pe'or: that means he took away a certain 'dating' of the story and gave it a more general character in speaking of 'a plurality of gods' etc. It is also remarkable that the specific 'wrath of God' in *Num.* 25 has been omitted and is just mentioned as a marginal possibility (see p. 252s.).

On the other hand all stress is laid upon the temptation to which Israel is exposed, which is cleverly designed by Balaam as a snare to rob the people from its blessing and communion with God. The devilish plan is made and executed and is successful: the Jews 'transgressed the laws of their fathers.'⁶² Accepting the belief in a plurality of gods and determining to sacrifice them in accordance with the established rites of the people of the country, they revelled in strange meats and, to please these women, ceased not to do everything contrary to that which their Law ordained' (§139). This is the school-example of those temptations by which Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman world might be seduced, as we see also in Philo (cf. p. 258): transgression of dietary laws, inter-

61 See e.g. the concluding passage of *Ant. Jud.* x which brings Josephus' rendering of Daniel to a close. The lesson, Josephus draws from the clear fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy was discussed in my article, quoted on p. 246 nt. 16.

62 See the statement of Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* XX 5,2, §100 about the apostate Tiberius Alexander, the nephew of Philo: τοῖς γὰρ πατρίοις οὐκ ἐνέμεινεν οὗτος ἔθελον and the text from *B. J.* VII 3,3, §50, quoted on p. 250, nt. 30.

marriage with gentiles, accepting polytheism. Josephus has actualized that old history, because along those ways his contemporaries living as a minority in the great world could be seduced to forsake the Law of Moses, that constitution of Israel that made this people unique. But why should they bother about that law? Was it not a fake, that made this people a miserable nation separated from all the rest of mankind? Josephus offers in that speech of Zambrias the rationale of apostasy by people who could not bear 'the Yoke'.

We do not hear much about apostasy from Judaism in the available sources which may be due to a great extent to the fragmentary state of the tradition. But both Philo and Josephus show that the danger was a very real one and warn against it by portraying the end of the apostates.

The importance of this account by Josephus lies in the fact that it gives us a clear insight in Israel's struggle for its identity in the first century A.D. in the world of the aliens, the Diaspora.

The Divine Predicate “The Beginning and the End” in Flavius Josephus and the Apocalypse of John

The title of this paper juxtaposes the name of the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus fraternally alongside that of the author of the last book of the Bible. This may occasion a degree of surprise, as some may wonder whether a self-respecting scholar can in good conscience pair them together like this. These contemporaries were, after all, diametrical opposites in many respects, and one can imagine that if the two had ever met, the atmosphere would not have stayed at the level of *bien étonnés de se trouver ensemble* but would probably have ended with mutual anathemas.

Both in life and in purpose Josephus and John moved in opposite directions. The former initially played a part in the Jewish revolt against Rome, but took a dim view of the hopelessness of that war and became a courtier at the court of the Flavian emperors; the other remained a follower of Jesus, the crucified “king of the Jews”, and in exile on the bare island of Patmos wrote a book against “the whore on the seven hills”, a book which Harald Fuchs rightly classes with the documents that bore witness to the “intellectual resistance to Rome”.¹ Josephus was focused on the past and gave a detailed description of the fall of Jerusalem in 70 and of the history of his people; John looked to the future and described “what must soon take place” (Rev 22.6); he saw the New Jerusalem descending from heaven, after God’s judgment over the earth. Josephus is the apologist of his people in dire straits, humiliated and dismayed, and no less of himself; John is the prophet who announces the fall of “the great city that rules over the kings of the earth” (17.18) and proclaims the triumph of its God: “the Lord, our God, the Almighty reigns” (19.6). Josephus’s extensive oeuvre found its place in the quiet study rooms of scholars, but John’s Apocalypse inspired and, through the centuries, kept alive the restlessness of all who, burdened by the injustices of this world, yearn for the consummation in the kingdom of peace.

It would be a simple task to expand on these differences. But however unmistakable and deep-rooted these contrasts may be, we must not forget that, as we have said, they were contemporaries in the last part of the first century CE and that they were at home in the same world from a geographical point of view. But it is especially important not to overlook the fact that they were linked by their faith to the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. However high he managed

* Translated from the Dutch by David E. Orton.

1 H. Fuchs, *Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom in der antiken Welt*, Berlin 1964.

to climb in the emperor's favour and however emphatic his criticism of his people, Josephus never went so far as to abandon his faith in the confession of the "Hear, O Israel, the Lord is our God, the Lord is One" (Deut 6.4).² Nor is this the case with the writer of the Apocalypse, who warns so earnestly against the seductions of the sacrifices to idols (2.14, 20). A large portion of Josephus's oeuvre is devoted to proclaiming the history of the Old Testament, and John's Revelation is saturated with the language of "Moses and the Prophets".³

To observe this connection between the two is not to gloss over the differences, especially not where the confession of this same God in teaching and in life is so differently expressed and experienced in Josephus and John. Nonetheless, Josephus and John find themselves on the same side of the fence when it comes to the crucial choice between monotheism and polytheism in the ancient world.

Now there is a striking agreement between these two authors in that both of them speak of God as "the Beginning and the End", an epithet that is not found among the many names and references to God in the Old Testament. So can one agree with Vincent Taylor that this is "only a variant" of the term "the First and the Last", which precedes it in the Apocalypse, because "the belief that the creation and consummation of all things are divine acts is fundamentally Biblical"?⁴

The correctness of this comment is unobjectionable as an observation, but there are problems with seeing it as the basis for the use of the term in this context. After all, one cannot automatically equate "divine acts" with "divine essence", of which the predicate in question speaks. Further, the question arises why such a variant, if that is what it is, is used, while he also passes over the fact that this parallel with Josephus exists, which Taylor knows of, though apparently only by hearsay.⁵ But there is no question of there being such a variant in Josephus, since he does not use the term "the First and the Last".

2 It is known that this text is the first of three that together make the Shema (the first word of Deut 6.4 in the Hebrew); this Shema is pronounced during the morning and evening prayer, twice a day. "It is Israel's foundational confession to the one God and to his commandments", as P. Billerbeck says in his detailed discussion of the Shema in H.L. Strack – P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Munich 1928, vol. IV 1, pp. 189–207 (quoting from p. 189).

3 On this way of indicating the Old Testament, which is customary in the New Testament, see Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 240.

4 V. Taylor, *The Names of Jesus* (London, 1953), p. 158.

5 He refers to it (*op. cit.*, p. 157: "familiar to Josephus") in a summary of the view of R.H. Charles (see below) but without citing the text of Josephus itself, let alone discussing it.

So is this agreement between Josephus and John coincidental, and if not, what perspectives then become evident in relation to provenience, meaning and application?

I

In the Apocalypse of John this predicate is audible twice,⁶ namely in the triumphant concluding section, combined with other predicates in a sonorous formula.

It appears for the first time in ch. 21. The seer has been permitted to see the new heaven and the new earth, as well as the new Jerusalem that comes down from heaven. He hears that the “former things (= the present world order) have passed”. Then “the one seated on the throne”, i.e. God himself, pronounces these words (21.6): “It is done! I am the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end”,⁷ followed by some promises.

In the second case (22.13) it is not God but Jesus Christ⁸ who speaks. He announces that he will soon pronounce judgment on everyone's deeds and then adds the declaration: “I am the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, *the beginning and the end*”; following this he pronounces a blessing and a curse.⁹

In both instances, then, it is not a question of an epithet given to one's god by a human being, as is frequently the case in expressions of praise to gods or statements about them, but a case of self-revelation by the deity. This form, prefixed by the emphatic ἐγώ εἰμι, is familiar from the ancient world, including the New Testament, where it is found with particular frequency in the Gospel of John.¹⁰

One has been right to point out that such revelation formulae also occur in the vision with which this apocalypse begins, namely at 1.8: “I am the Alpha

6 In a number of mss. the epithet is also found in Rev 1.8 following the words “I am the Alpha and the Omega”; see the note in the edition by K. Aland, M. Black, B.M. Metzger & A. Wikgren, *The Greek New Testament*, 1966, p. 837. But this reading is not generally adopted in the text because of the weak support for it in the transmission and because of the clear harmonization with Rev 21.6.

7 The Greek text reads: ἐγώ (εἰμι) τὸ Ἄλφα καὶ τὸ Ὠ, ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος.

8 The speaker is not explicitly indicated, but it can be inferred from the context that it is Jesus Christ.

9 The Greek text reads: ἐγώ τὸ Ἄλφα καὶ τὸ Ὠ, ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος, ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος.

10 E. Schweizer, *Ego Eimi*, Göttingen 1939; R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, Freiburg i.Br. 1971, Pt. II, pp. 59–70, excursus 9, *Herkunft und Sinn der Formel ἐγώ εἰμι*.

and the Omega', says the Lord God, who is and who was and who is to come, the Almighty"¹¹ and 1.17f., where Christ says: "Do not be afraid; I am the first and the last, and the living one. I was dead, and see, I am alive for ever and ever."

An echo of 1.18 is found in 2.8, though here there is no explicit talk of a self-revelation; this is clearly assumed, however. Just as in 2.1 the words "These are the words of him who holds the seven stars in his right hand, who walks among the seven golden lampstands" pick up on 1.12 and 16, so too 2.8 clearly recalls 1.18 with the opening, "These are the words of the first and the last, who was dead and came to life."¹²

So it appears from the comparison of these texts that not just one fixed formula is being used here but that in 21.6 and 22.13 a combination of different, independent elements is being presented. Now it is customary¹³ to treat the three terms together and regard them simply as variants. But actually there is every reason to view them separately, to establish their provenience and background if possible so as to answer later the question of their combination, because as we have seen, the link comes only at the end.

The curious reference to the first and the last letters of the Greek alphabet has always attracted avid attention, so that all the various lexicons give it a separate treatment.¹⁴ It is specific to the Apocalypse, as far as is known, and has to be explained through numbers mysticism.¹⁵ For the combination "the first and the last" reference is always made to a few texts in the Old Testament;¹⁶ the agreement between the Apocalypse and the Septuagint is not verbatim, but it is still substantial enough that a borrowing can be assumed, either that

11 Cf. also Rev 4.8 κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος. 11.17 κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν. 16.5 ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν.

12 The text of 1.18 reads ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος, and that of 2.8 Τάδε λέγει ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος, ὃς ἐγένετο νεκρὸς καὶ ἔζησεν.

13 See e.g. G. Kittel, "A Ω", in G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Stuttgart 1933, vol. I, pp. 1–3; E. Loymeyer, "A. und O.", in T. Klauser, *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, Stuttgart 1950, vol. I, cols. 1–4; E. Lohse, "A. und O.", in K. Galling, *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*,³ Tübingen 1957, vol. I, col. 1.

14 In addition to the articles mentioned in the previous note see also for instance L. St. Alban Wells, "Alpha and Omega", in: J. Hastings, *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, Edinburgh 1915, vol. I, pp. 50–51; P.S. Minear, "Alpha and Omega", *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, New York-Nashville 1962, vol. I, pp. 88–89; M. Rissi, "A. und O.", in: B. Reicke & L. Rost, *Biblisch-Historisches Handwörterbuch*, Göttingen 1962, vol. I, col. 1; A. van den Born, "Alfa en Omega", in: A. van den Born, *Bijbels Woordenboek*,³ Roermond 1966–1969, cols. 42–43; see also further literature cited in these articles.

15 On this see G. Kittel, *op. cit.*, pp. 2–3.

16 I.e. Isaiah 41.4; 43.10; 44.6; 48.12.

John used another Greek translation or that, as is generally assumed, he himself translated from the Hebrew.¹⁷

But what is the origin and background of the divine predicate “the beginning and the end”? We already noted (see above) that there is no parallel to this to be found in the Old Testament. But there is nothing to be found in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha either, while as yet the Qumran library has not thrown any light on this matter.¹⁸ Where these sources leave us in the lurch, others, as we shall see, do offer some help.

It will already be evident from the title of this paper that one does not have to venture far from the environs of the New Testament to find the same divine predicate, namely in Flavius Josephus. This has been known for a long time, since J.J. Wettstein drew attention to it more than two centuries ago,¹⁹ and since then, if any attention is paid to this epithet at all,²⁰ this parallelism comes to the fore.²¹

In the first place we must mention Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* VIII 280, i.e.—oddly enough—somewhere in the middle of that great historical account. In the passage where the parallel is found, Josephus is describing how when Jeroboam, the king of the northern kingdom of Israel, makes an incursion into Judah, the king of Judah, Abijah, addresses the people and his opponent (VIII 277–281). This speech is a version of 2 Chronicles 13.4–12, shaped in his usual vein by Josephus.²² He advises²³ his opponents to change their minds and to

17 Taking the texts mentioned in the previous note in succession, one finds the following expressions: (a) ἐγὼ θεὸς πρῶτος καὶ εἰς τὰ ἐπερχόμενα ἐγὼ εἰμι, (b) ἐμπροσθέν μου οὐκ ἐγένετο ἄλλος θεὸς καὶ μετ’ ἐμὲ οὐκ ἔσται, (c) ἐγὼ θεὸς πρῶτος καὶ ἐγὼ μετὰ ταῦτα, (d) ἐγὼ εἰμι πρῶτος καὶ ἐγὼ εἰμι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

18 From the index in H. Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*, Tübingen 1966, vol. II, p. 392, it appears that the texts of interest to us are not dealt with in this very detailed overview.

19 J.J. Wettstein, *Novum Testamentum Graecum*, Amsterdam 1752, vol. II, p. 841. I have not looked into whether reference to this is already given in commentaries before Wettstein.

20 It has to be said that many commentaries do not do this!

21 See e.g. H.B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, London 1906, p. 276; R.H. Charles, *The Revelation of St. John*, Edinburgh 1920, vol. II, pp. 220–221; E. Lohmeyer, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*,² Tübingen 1953, p. 168; G. Kittel, *op. cit.*, p. 1 and G. Delling, ἀρχή, in: Kittel, *Theol. Wörterbuch*, vol. I, p. 478 and τέλος, in: Kittel, *Theol. Wörterbuch*, vol. VIII, p. 51.

22 It is a common method of Josephus in the books of his *Antiquitates*, which run in parallel with the biblical account, to take special features which are noted in Chronicles but are not mentioned in Kings and interweave them in the books of Kings and present them in a different form in line with his style.

23 In §281 Josephus uses συμβουλεύω at this point, a characteristic word in this connection for delivering a political speech to move an assembly to come to a particular choice; see

acknowledge the source of the strength that had led them to such heights of prosperity,²⁴ namely justice and piety towards God. Only by this means, and not through superior numbers, can one overcome.²⁵ And this is what Abijah and his people rely on, “who have kept the laws from the beginning and worshipped the only God, him whom no hands have formed out of perishable matter and no wicked king has cunningly made to deceive the masses”—this refers to the introduction of idolatry of the golden calves which Jeroboam had reintroduced (§279)²⁶—but who is his own work and “*beginning and end of all things*” (ὃς ἔργον ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος τῶν ἀπάντων).²⁷

The words quoted are a paraphrase of the text in 2 Chron 13.11: “we keep the charge of the Lord our God, but you have abandoned him”. We can clearly see how Josephus here describes Israel’s idolatry in his own wording: the

my “Studies over de zogenaamde eerste brief van Clemens, I, het litteraire genre”, in: *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen* (Letterkunde), n.s. 33.4, Amsterdam 1970, pp. 33–38.

24 It is interesting to note how Josephus takes the concluding challenge in 2 Chron. 13.12: “O Israelites, do not fight against the Lord, the God of your ancestors; for you cannot succeed” and turns its negative form into a positive one: τὸ προαγαγὸν ὑμᾶς ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον μέγεθος εὐδαιμονίας γνωρίσαι (§281). The power that has brought them thus far is the true service of Israel’s God in contrast to the idolatry of Jeroboam. The idea expressed here, that the correct worship of God has led to the wellbeing of the state, cannot be further examined in the context of this discussion. I simply refer to the fact that in Dionysius Hal., *Antiq. Rom.* II too, the extensive description of Roman religion and state institutions is permeated by this idea; see e.g. the words Ῥωμαῖοι διεφύλαξαν εὐδαιμονοῦσαν τὴν πόλιν ἐπὶ πολλὰς γενεάς in *Ant. Rom.* II 18 and 24.1.

25 For this idea cf. Ps 33.16.

26 See in the OT 1 Kgs 15.30: “because of the sins of Jeroboam that he committed and that he caused Israel to commit”; 2 Kgs 10.29, 31 King Jehu “did not turn from the sins of Jeroboam son of Nebat, which he caused Israel to commit”, and similarly in other passages.

27 Note the addition of τῶν ἀπάντων, which does not occur in the Apocalypse of John but is understood; see the preceding πάντα and γέγοναν (21.5–6).—For the conclusion of the speech with this divine predicate see also below; here Josephus clearly adopts an existing custom, but the effect is apt, nonetheless. The other places where Josephus uses the phrase do not throw any light on this text, except for the formula in *c. Apionem* II 190, which will be discussed below. In *Ant. Jud.* XV 205 it is purely chronological: κατὰ μὲν τὰς ἀρχὰς πιστὸς ἦν . . . τέλος ἐξείπεν ἀπάσας τὰς ἐντολάς τοῦ βασιλέως; in *Ant. Jud.* XX 18 a prediction is made over a child in its mother’s womb that through God’s good care it καὶ ἀρχῆς τυχὸν καὶ τέλους εὐτυχοῦς τευξόμενον—so here there is talk of the beginning and end of life in opposition to each other; in *Bell. Jud.* VI 403: the end of the war is easier than the beginning. In addition it is worth noting that in *Bell. Jud.* III 440, VI 9, VII 157 (in the latter two places πέρας, not τέλος) the end of something is the beginning of something else (is the image of the circle an element here—see p. 198 n. 132).

introduction of the worship of idols in flagrant conflict with the commandment of Exod 20.4.²⁸

Over against this stands the true worship of God, in which the Jewish people can find their real happiness and prosperity. Here too, for the reader of Josephus interested in understanding the historian's "message" his commitment is immediately apparent:²⁹ the Jewish people, Josephus's people, after all, live in the humiliation of the catastrophe of 70 under the accusation of atheism³⁰ in a world of temples and idols and with the temptation to fall away from the God of the fathers and to go along with the dominant and successful "heathen". In this situation Josephus tells in his own words the "biblical history" with the crucial choice between the worship of idols and the worship of Israel's God.

The closing sentence quoted, in which Josephus expresses his belief in God, is found in a striking place in Abijah's speech, namely as the conclusion and climax of his considerations, which then lead to the counsel (*symbolia*) for the present, the "Gebot der Stunde" in §281. Here the people are called upon to choose between the worship of idols and worship of the true God, "their own" God. Who this God is, is expressed in negative and positive wording. But the words "He is . . . the beginning and end of all things" are a surprise; they seem to sit uncomfortably with the whole train of thought. But on the other hand that makes them all the more effective at the conclusion, as a climax. This observation makes it very improbable that this phrase is not created *ad hoc*, but has been adopted as a religious term that was so heavily charged that it could function as the climax to the speech. That this term must have a deep meaning and has not been adopted as a weak filler is evident not only from its position at the end, but also from the fact that it follows, and that it *can* follow, after the oxymoron that God is "his own work"!

The paradox just mentioned is certainly very understandable, however strange it may sound, in this connection. After all it is the positive pronouncement that stands in a contrastive parallelism with the preceding negative

28 See in §280 the true worship of Israel's God, ὃν οὐ χεῖρες ἐποίησαν ἐξ ὕλης φθαρτῆς; see E. Lohse, χειροποίητος, in: Kittel-Friedrich, *Theol. Wörterbuch*, vol. IX, pp. 425–426, and Acts 7.41.

29 See my contribution, "Josephus' Account of the Story of Israel's Sin with Alien Women in the Country of Midian (Num. 25:1ff.)", in: *Travels in the World of the Old Testament: Studies Presented to Prof. M.A. Beek on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, Assen 1974, pp. 240–261, where I pointed out this motif in Josephus's treatment of the passage in question.

30 On this accusation see E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 4th ed., Leipzig 1909, vol. III, pp. 548–549.

words: θεὸν . . . ὃν οὐ χεῖρες ἐποίησαν ἐξ ὕλης φθαρτῆς. Then it is an obvious thing to look also for the contrast for the phrase ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος τῶν ἀπάντων. And we find it in the words: οὐδ' ἐπινοία πονηροῦ βασιλέως ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν ὄχλων ἀπάτῃ κατεσχέυασεν. And that is true in view of the following consideration. What was the *archē*, the point of departure for the idolatry? The plan, the designs of the corrupt Jeroboam! What was the *telos*, the goal, the result of the idolatry? The fact that the "host"³¹ was seduced and deceived and ultimately met its misfortune, because the Scripture clearly teaches that the reason for the fall of Israel's kingdom in 722 BC and 586 BC was the idolatry of the people. Over against this *archē kai telos* of a particular piece of historical development stands Israel's God, who is the *archē kai telos* of all things, the universe and its entire history.³² The words also speak clearly alongside ἔργον αὐτοῦ with the antithesis: of Himself/of all things. He causes the latter to begin and leads them to their end (perhaps the idea that He has dominion over them plays a role here too; see below). Now it becomes really evident how effectively Josephus applies the wording he has adopted. The contrast between (a) the true God whose being can be expressed like this and (b) the idols worshipped in images, is particularly striking and telling. Thus the combination *archē kai telos pantōn* seems to have a clear meaning, a confession of the God whom Israel confesses as "his own". It is much more than a formulation of the "eternity of God"³³ but, critically, like any creed it confesses God as the origin, goal and meaning of existence.

Alongside this text from the *Antiquitates* a second is always mentioned, which may be found in Josephus's apology of the Jewish people, namely *Contra Apionem* II 190. Speaking about the elevated Jewish view of God he says: "He is *the beginning and middle and end of all things*". So here we have the predicate

31 ὄχλος is of course being used in a pejorative sense here, as so frequently in Greek; see R. Mayer, ὄχλος, in: Kittel-Friedrich, *Theol. Wörterbuch*, vol. V, pp. 582–583.

32 This is much more general than the passage in Moses' farewell discourse, *Ant. Jud.* IV 318, to which A. Schlatter also refers in his *Wie sprach Josephus von Gott?* Gütersloh 1910, p. 44. But as a contrast the saying that Josephus places on the lips of Moses is not bad: αὐτός (i.e. God) ἦν ὁ καὶ τὴν ἀφήγησιν αὐτῶν διδοὺς καὶ τὰ τέλη χαρίζόμενος, ὑποστρατήγῳ χρώμενος ἐμοὶ καὶ ὑπηρετῇ ὦν τὸν ἡμέτερον λαὸν εὐεργετεῖν ἠθέλησεν. Even if these two texts were variations on the same theme, then the plur. τέλη here is striking, as is the application to Israel's history in Moses' life, which contains a limitation of τῶν ἀπάντων. This is in my view further evidence that in *Ant. Jud.* VIII 280 Josephus was making use of an existing formula, as will also be clear from what follows.

33 Thus G. Kittel, *op. cit.*, p. 1: "Anschauung der als Anfang und Ende ewig seienden Gottheit", and Delling, *op. cit.*, VIII, p. 51: "Ewigkeitsaussage".

expanded with another element, namely “the middle”. Or was it another formula? Is it a question of variants?

Discussion of this confession in its context will be postponed for the time being and dealt with later. For now we may note simply that in his book *Wie sprach Josephus von Gott* A. Schlatter notes this text together with the one from the *Antiquitates*, but does not discuss them.³⁴ In connection with these two Josephus texts Kittel wrote the rather enigmatic words: “Palästinische, aber offenkundig nicht bodenständige, sondern übernommene Form”,³⁵ in relation to a quotation from Plato to be mentioned later (see p. 169). Why this should be “palästinisch” is not made clear. Can he say this because the formula occurs in Josephus, who indeed came from Palestine? But the historian wrote in Greek, for Greeks and Romans. In the terminology here lie a number of questions relating to the history of religions and methodology which are dealt with too cursorily in this cryptogram and which can only be brought to a solution by means of a careful reading of the texts in question.

Nor is much light shed in the commentaries on the book *Contra Apionem*.³⁶ In 1902 Reinach drew attention to a saying in Talmud Yerushalmi, *Sanhedrin* fol. 18a: “God is truth”, because the Hebrew word (*emet*) is made up of the first, middle and last letters of the alphabet. He noted that there is a difficulty with this explanation because the *mem* is not the middle letter of the Hebrew alphabet; he therefore suspected that a translation from the Greek lies behind it, namely of ἀρχή, μέσσα and τέλος, though he undermined his case somewhat with the observation that in transcriptions the Greek τ is rarely rendered by the Hebrew *tav*. Thackeray referred to this explanation by Reinach and pointed additionally to Rev 1.8 and 21.6. This does not help us much further.

When the editions of Thackeray and Reinach appeared, however, it was certainly possible to say more about this formula, since in 1920 the famous English researcher of the Jewish Pseudepigrapha R.H. Charles presented the necessary material in his monumental commentary on the Apocalypse of John.³⁷ In Rev 22.13, according to him, we have “an abbreviated form of an ancient Orphic

34 In his book *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josephus*, Gütersloh 1932, Schlatter does not discuss these texts at all.

35 G. Kittel, *op. cit.*, p. 1, n. 4.

36 J.G. Müller, *Des Flavius Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion*, Basel 1877, p. 312 (reference is made only to Ps 110.1, the texts from Isaiah—see above, p. 162, n. 17—and Revelation); H. St. J. Thackeray, *Josephus*, Cambridge, Mass.—London 1926, vol. I, *The Life—Against Apion*, p. 369 n. 1; T. Reinach, *Flavius Josephus Contre Apion*, Paris 1930, pp. 117–118.

37 R.H. Charles, *Revelation*, pp. 220–221.

saying", as preserved by Plato (see below, p. 169). This Orphic saying was very well known in the ancient world:

"In the first century A.D. it was familiar to the Palestinian Jews, as we know from Josephus . . . In later times it was adopted by the Talmudists and given a Jewish turn in the third century A.D. by Simon ben Lakish" (c. 250). After citing a number of passages in rabbinic literature, he points further to eight or so texts from the church fathers. In Lohmeyer³⁸ we find practically the same series from the fathers³⁹ (N.B. with precisely the same incorrect reference)⁴⁰ with the comment: "Es hat in der frühchristlichen Literatur eine wandelreiche Geschichte". Lohmeyer argued that the Alpha and Omega formula is "hier durch eine alte geheiligte Formel eine Deutung gegeben". He too refers to Plato, Josephus and the Talmud, and additionally Egypt.⁴¹ According to this German commentator "der Sinn dieser Formel . . . [is] . . . der gleiche wie die der anderen", i.e. "who is and who was and who is coming", "der der zeitlosen göttlichen Wirklichkeit und Totalität".⁴²

With this account of the views of Charles and Lohmeyer we are back with the Apocalypse of John. After theirs, no major religio-historical commentary

38 E. Lohmeyer, *Offenbarung*, p. 168.

39 He cites *Praed. Petri*; Ignatius, *Eph.* 14.1; Justinus, *Coh. ad Gent.* 25; Irenaeus, *A.H.* III 25.2; Hippolytus, *Ref.* I 19; Clement of Alexandria *Protr.* VI 69, with the addition "u.ö" ("and frequently"), which always seems somewhat cryptic. In connection with the discussion later in this paper it seemed to me important to reproduce this list.

40 Exactly as Charles does, he writes: "Just. Coh ad Gent", without indicating that this should be "Pseudo-Justin"; see below, p. 174 n. 61.

41 For the reference to Egypt, see the Magical Papyrus, which will be discussed below. In relation to the material in the Talmud he observes: "wo es sich, freilich in spätern Zeugnissen, mit Buchstaben-symbolik verquickt hat". On p. 179 at Rev 22.13 Lohmeyer mentions a further text from the Mandaean Liturgy, Manda—d-Häia; see E.S. Drower, *The Canonical Prayerbook of the Mandaeans*, Leiden 1959, p. 76: ("Thou art the First. Thou art the Last") and from the *Bhagavadgita*, 10th song, v. 21 (in the translation by L. von Schroeder, 1920, p. 48: "Ich bin der Anfang, Mitte ich und Ende auch der Wesen all").

42 Lohmeyer, *Offenbarung*, p. 168. For the rabbinic materials see G. Kittel, *op. cit.*, pp. 2–3; he notes that speculation about *emet* is "erst vom 3. Jhdt. n. Chr. an nachweisbar, was jedoch nichts gegen die Möglichkeit höheren Alters beweist" ("demonstrable only from the 3rd cent. CE on, though this does not constitute evidence against the possibility of greater antiquity).

has appeared on the last book of the Bible.⁴³ But the situation with regard to the divine predicate “the Beginning and the End” remains unchanged. The connections they point to and the interpretation based on them are still current today, being summarized and disseminated in such influential publications as Kittel’s *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* and the lexicon *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*.⁴⁴

However, as we have already seen, in the interpretation of Josephus *Ant. Jud.* VIII 280 (see p. 162 above), there may be some doubt about the accuracy of the explanation given by Charles, Lohmeyer and others. A critical look at the list of patristic texts that are supposed to bear witness to this “wandelreiche Geschichte” that has affected the Christian heritage reveals that a considerable quantity of mixed materials have been put in one basket. It is, moreover, desirable to take a closer look at the various texts that have not so far been considered in the research but must be viewed as relevant, so as not to lump everything together religio-historically as “überkommenes Gut”, as Lohmeyer, for instance does so easily.

For all these reasons it seemed to me desirable to undertake a renewed examination of the provenance, sense and meaning of this divine predicate in Flavius Josephus and the Apocalypse.

II

So as not to burden the study with ballast that may be regarded as of little significance for the history of the predicate, it will be good to eliminate a number of texts mentioned by Charles and Lohmeyer but not examined for their relevance. Here I have in mind the references to Christian and non-Christian authors which are simply quotations of a text in Plato, *Leges* IV 715E–716C, with a particular application, though it will be desirable to look at these references in their context, as it might perhaps emerge how these authors understood this predicate. Hugo Grotius already referred to this passage in Plato in his “Annotationes” on Rev 1:8;⁴⁵ and since then it is part of the stock-in-trade of discussion. Hence it is desirable here to deal with it in its context.

43 On the most recent commentary on the Apocalypse of John, which however does not devote any attention to this issue, see below, p. 225.

44 For this, see p. 161 n. 13.

45 Along with with the texts usually cited in his day Grotius also read this divine predicate in this passage.

In the preceding section Plato set out the fact that in the city where the Law is without effect, corruption is at the door, but where the Law rules and the rulers are slaves to the Law, great prosperity will be realized. Now the question arises of the position of aliens resident in the city: what is their position, since—the assumption is—they are not subject to the laws that according to Greek law apply only to the citizens? The following answer is given: ἄνδρες, τοῖνυν φῶμεν πρὸς αὐτούς, ὁ μὲν δὴ θεός, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ παλαιὸς λόγος, ἀρχὴν τε καὶ τελευτὴν καὶ μέσα τῶν ὄντων ἀπάντων ἔχων, εὐθεία περαίνει κατὰ φύσιν περιπορευόμενος. τῷ δὲ αἰεὶ συνέπεται δίκη τῶν ἀπολειπομένων τοῦ Θεοῦ νόμου τιμωρός. ἥς ὁ μὲν εὐδαιμονήσιν μέλλων ἐχόμενος συνέπεται ταπεινὸς καὶ κεκοσμημένος, ὁ δὲ τις ἐξαρθεὶς ὑπὸ μεγαλαυχίας ἢ χρήμασιν ἐπαιρόμενος ἢ τιμαῖς, ἢ καὶ σώματος εὐμορφίᾳ ἅμα νεότητι καὶ ἀνοίᾳ φλέγεται τὴν ψυχὴν μετ' ὕβρεως, ὡς οὔτε ἄρχοντος οὔτε τινὸς ἡγεμόνος δεόμενος. This is followed by a description of the resultant desolation, which soon culminates in such a person being subjected to a formidable punishment by the *Dikē*, making a complete ruin of himself, his house and his city. The question then is: if things are thus ordered, what is a thinking person to do? The answer is clear: everyone must decide to join those who follow God. The question that then follows is: τίς οὖν δὴ πράξις φίλη καὶ ἀκόλουθος θεῷ; the answer being: μία, καὶ ἓνα λόγον ἔχουσα ἀρχαῖον, ὅτι τῷ μὲν ὁμοίῳ τὸ ὅμοιον ὄντι μετρίῳ φίλον ἂν εἴη, τὰ δ' ἄμετρα οὔτε ἀλλήλοις οὔτε τοῖς ἐμμέτροις. ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἡμῖν πάντων χρημάτων μέτρον ἂν εἴη μάλιστα.

So we see that this saying about God “who has beginning and end and middle of all things”—we shall deal with this separately later⁴⁶—is not found in a theological context but in a discussion about ethics. Taking this view of God as its basis, the text says that He travels around everywhere in accordance with his being, penetrating straight through everything, and that He is accompanied by retributive justice, punishing those who depart from the divine law. This is the basis for what one might label with the later term “two-ways doctrine”, the choice between the path of god, which leads to salvation, and that of evil, which leads to corruption. The sensible person of course knows what the choice will be, namely to follow God's way. The account proceeds to consider how one takes this path.

So Plato brings this “old saying” to his readers' attention and takes it as a premise, like a fundamental truth, in laying the foundations for a *universally applicable* ethics that can and must function as a guideline even for people to whom the laws of the *polis* do not apply. It is generally assumed (see the discussion on pp. 191–93 below) that Plato was quoting an Orphic poem.

46 It may be noted that there is talk here of “God who *has*”, not “*is*”; see below, p. 216.

In what way, then, is this passage used by later authors,⁴⁷ and how do they interpret the divine predicate in this connection? The first church father to cite him is *Irenaeus*, *Adv. Haereses* III 25.5. Against the Gnostics who blaspheme the good God and respond to His good deeds with a lascivious lifestyle,⁴⁸ Plato is placed in position: “Quibus religiosior Plato ostenditur, qui eundem Deum et iustum et bonum confessus est, habentem potestatem omnium, ipsum facientem iudicium, sic dicens”: and this is followed with a verbatim quotation beginning with the words ὁ μὲν δὴ θεός up to and including τιμωρός. As evidence that the Creator is good, this is followed by a similarly well-known quotation from *Timaeus* 29E.⁴⁹ This combination is also found thus in Atticus (see below); on another use of the combination “beginning, middle and end” in Irenaeus, see below.

47 E. des Places is right to state in his edition (*Platon*, vol. XI 2, *Les Lois*, Paris 1956, p. 65 n. 2): “Peu de passages ont eu pareille fortune dans la tradition indirecte.” Here he takes up a list of the texts where this saying of Plato’s is cited, having previously, though not so comprehensively, collected them in his essay: “La tradition indirecte des Lois de Platon (livres I–VI),” in: *Mélanges J. Saunier*, Lyon 1944, pp. 34–35. But he offers no discussion of the use that later authors make of this text. He does refer, but only very briefly, to J. Daniélou, *Message évangélique et culture hellénistique au IIe et IIIe siècles*, Tournai 1961, pp. 108–109. Following C. Andresen, *Logos und Nomos, die Polemik des Kelsos wider das Christentum*, Berlin 1955, pp. 300–302, he distinguishes two lines: “L’une l’interprète en un sens plus cosmologique. Elle est d’origine stoïcienne. Mais elle avait été reprise par les moyens platoniciens. L’autre est plus éthique . . . Les chrétiens utiliseront les deux traditions.” In this connection Andresen notes (p. 301 n. 27): “Die Christen übernehmen die Wanderstelle—um sie ihren Zwecken dienlich zu machen.” Since our aim in this discussion is to acquaint ourselves with the understanding of the divine predicate and not so much to establish the channels of tradition by which this quotation came to the Christians, it seemed appropriate to me to deal with the texts afresh in their contexts. Since Charles and Lohmeyer (see above, p. 167 n. 39) mention only the Christian texts, we deal with these first.

48 Only the Latin translation of this text is preserved. Irenaeus says of the Gnostics he opposes: “non similiter secundum dignationem munerationis eius conversati sunt, sed in deliciis et luxuriis versati sunt adversus benevolentiam eius, adhuc et blasphemantes eum qui tanta beneficia in eos fecerit.” The basis of the reasoning lies in the rule, generally accepted in antiquity, that someone who “does well” may expect to receive thanks in word and deed; on this “mutuality principle” see H. Bolkestein, *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum*, Utrecht 1939, pp. 156–170, 317–318, and my article: “Die Motivierung der Feindesliebe in Lukas VI 32–35,” in *Novum Testamentum* 8 (1966), pp. 284–300. Notable in the above-cited passage from Irenaeus is the expression “secundum dignationem” = κατ’ ἀξίαν.

49 On this see my note, “De ἀφθονία van God in de oudchristelijke literatuur,” in: *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen*, afd. Letterkunde, n.s. 36.2, Amsterdam 1973, pp. 23, 46.

The heathen Plato is superior to the Gnostics, who call themselves Christians, because he expresses his belief in a God who is just and good. The text from the *Leges* witnesses to God who is just, that is who makes judgments about the deeds of human beings, which in this context means that the Gnostics will have to pay for their shameful lives.

From Irenaeus's introduction it is apparent that he interprets the words ἀρχὴν τε καὶ τελευτὴν καὶ μέσα τῶν ὄντων ἀπάντων ἔχων as "the one having power over all" (*habentem potestatem omnium*). But he does not go into this further and does not make a connection with the texts from the Apocalypse, known to him, even though one might have expected him to do so precisely in connection with the Gnostic doctrine of the aeons and their view of the "unknown God", either here or elsewhere. But this is the only place where Irenaeus refers to *this* text from Plato.

In *Clement of Alexandria* there are four texts that may be considered in this context:

a. *Protrepticus* VI 69.4. Here it is asked who is the king of all things, concerning whom Plato speaks so enigmatically (*Epist.* II 312E), and the answer is: "God the measure of the truth of all that is". Just as measurable things are measured with a measure, so too the truth is measured and encompassed by knowing God. As proof, Moses is cited: Deut 25:13–15 concerning the good scales and measure.⁵⁰ "The only just measure, the really unique God, always the same in completely the same way,⁵¹ measures and weighs everything." Then in §4 follows a verbatim quotation from the *Laws*: ὁ μὲν δὴ θεός . . . τιμωρός, unintroduced, without mention of Plato's name. But immediately after, in 70.1, there follows: πόθεν, ὦ Πλάτων, ἀληθείαν αἰνίττη; πόθεν ἢ τῶν λόγων ἄφθοнос χορηγία τὴν θεοσέβειαν μαντευέται; Clement has Plato give the answer: "the generations of the barbarians are wiser than they"⁵² and he continues: "I know your teachers, though you may wish to hide them."

50 For allegorical exegesis, C. Mondésert (*Clement d'Alexandrie, le Protreptique*, Paris 1949, p. 134 n. 4) refers to Philo, *De Somniis* II 193 v.

51 Mondésert (*op. cit.* p. 134 n. 5) refers here to Plato, *Phaedo* 78D: ὡσαύτως . . . κατὰ ταῦτὰ ἔχειν.

52 Mondésert (*op. cit.* p. 135 n. 2) refers here to Plato, *Phaedo* 78A: πολλὰ δὲ καὶ τῶν βαρβάρων γένη, οὓς πάντας χρὴ διερευνᾶσθαι ζητοῦντας τοιοῦτον ἐπωδόν, a text which Clement quotes verbatim in *Stromateis* I 15.66.3; but Plato says there that there are good men all over Greece too, not using the comparative. On this subject see J.H. Waszink, "Some Observations on the Appreciation of 'The Philosophy of the Barbarians' in Early Christian Literature," in: *Mélanges offerts à Mademoiselle Christine Mohrmann*, Utrecht—Anvers 1963, pp. 40–56, esp. pp. 53ff.

Here, then, the quotation serves as a proof of God's justice. Plato expresses in enigmatic words what "holy" Moses said clearly. This text says nothing about the divine predicate. From the fact that this quotation is first given without indication of the source or attribution of a name, even though the name of Plato is mentioned, indeed addressed, immediately afterwards, we may reasonably conclude that the provenance of the quotation was known to Clement's readers.

b. *Paedag.* III 3.22.1: in relation to adulterers it is said: ἔπεται δὲ αὐτοῖς τῶν τολμημάτων τιμωρὸς ἡ δίκη. The words are worked into the context of Clement's account without a reminder of Plato; but they are clearly a reminiscence of the text of *Leges* IV.

c. *Strom.* II 22.132.1. In this chapter Clement declares that Plato's view is that the highest good consists in being equal with God and that this is in agreement with Holy Scripture. Plato says that this *homoiosis* must go in tandem with humility and so explains the Gospel saying: "Those who humble themselves will be exalted" (Luke 14:11; 18:14), as this is evident from what Plato "says in the Laws", and then follows the citation: first from ὁ μὲν δὴ θεὸς τοιμωρὸς. The latter word inspires Clement to make the interpretation: "See how he also combines reverent fear (*eulabeia*) with the divine law?"; then continuing with the following sentence from Plato: ἥς—ταπεινὸς καὶ κεκοσμημένος, the important word being *ταπεινός*. Clement then gives a long quotation from the subsequent 716CD,⁵³ closing the whole passage with the words: τοῦτο ἀρχαῖον εἶναι φήσας τὸ δόγμα τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου εἰς αὐτὸν ἤκουσαν διδασκαλίαν ἡνίξατο.

The full detail of this quotation shows that it was of great significance to Clement and that he may have had the entire text of Plato in front of him, not simply knowing the author but also the work from which the quotation is taken; so that he did not simply take a single separate little sentence from an anthology, even though it is not uncommon in similar florilegia to indicate the source with the name and title. According to Clement Plato recorded "the old doctrine"⁵⁴ here in accordance with his own confession, and for the Alexandrian Christian teacher this is a puzzling allusion, intelligible only to initiates (ἡνίξατο), that Plato borrowed his views from Moses' Law, and so an example of the "theft of the Greeks".⁵⁵ It is striking that Clement places full

53 Clement also quotes Plato, *Leg.* IV 716C in *Strom.* V 14.95.4 in a group of Plato quotations; here introduced by the words: "the Athenian alien speaks similarly." The emphasis here lies on the "measure"; see above.

54 Clement, then, speaks of ἀρχαῖον . . . τὸ δόγμα, referring to Plato's double use in 715E and 716C.

55 Clement deals with this in detail in *Strom.* I.

emphasis on the significance of this Plato text for “humility”; it should be borne in mind that in the Greek of his day, which is not influenced by biblical usage, *ταπεινός* has the unfortunate meaning “servile, base”,⁵⁶ but that is not the case here, which is why Plato was such an important ally. The emphasis lies on the element of reverent fear, which inspires this text. But it is evident that not the slightest attention is paid to what is said about God in his three-part formula.

d. *Strom.* VII 16.100.3: just as, at war, a soldier must not depart from the battle orders given him by the general, so too the order which the Logos has given, which we have received as the guide to knowledge and life, must not be abandoned. The masses⁵⁷ did not even investigate if there is someone who must be followed, who that is, and how. οἶος γὰρ ὁ λόγος, τοιόσδε καὶ ὁ βίος εἶναι τῷ πιστῷ προσήκει ὡς «ἐπεσθαι» δυνάσθαι «τῷ θεῷ» ἐξ ἀρχῆς τὰ πάντα «εὐθεῖαν περαίνοντι».

It is clear from the wording that there is a reminiscence here of *Leg.* IV 716A, but Plato is not mentioned by name. It is not even evident from Clement’s text that he is working with borrowed words, the quotation marks of course being supplied by the modern editor, in this case O. Stählin. Clement lets the words of Plato flow into his own sentences as a matter of course, just as many preachers will use biblical expressions in their sermons without always indicating that they are quoting Scripture, since their audiences, who know their Bible, recognize them as such. This comparison seems quite appropriate here; this would then be a clear indication of how well-known the quotation from Plato was. Be that as it may, for Clement the emphasis lies on “following God”.⁵⁸ Clement did not place particular emphasis on the threefold formula; he circumscribed it succinctly with the simple words: “ἐξ ἀρχῆς going through τὰ πάντα”, clearly giving “all” a local meaning.

If we survey the places where Clement employs the Plato quotation from *Leges* IV 715E–716, it emerges that he was very familiar with it and it was of considerable significance to him, but there is no speculation about the divine predicate. Nowhere is it brought into relation with the Revelation texts, and when, on the other hand, he mentions the latter (see below, p. 232), no correlation is drawn with the words of Plato. It is also quite striking that Clement interprets “the old saying” of which Plato speaks as a reference to the Law of

56 On this see Kwa Joe Liang, *Het begrip deemoed in I Clemens*, Utrecht 1951, pp. 90–104, who rightly points to the special character of this text in Plato (p. 90) and clearly illuminates the difference between the Greek, Jewish and Christian usage.

57 Greek: οἱ πολλοί, with its familiar pejorative connotations.

58 It is notable that in Plato’s text it is δίκη that follows. See W. Völker, *Der wahre Gnostiker nach Clemens Alexandrinus*, Berlin 1952, pp. 579–597 on “following God or Christ” in Clement.

Moses and does *not*, as is frequently done these days, label it as “Orphic”, even though he was perfectly familiar with Orphica.⁵⁹ It should be noted that for Clement Orpheus was, on the one hand, a vile seducer to idolatry, but on the other hand a witness to the one, true God, from which Clement concludes that the Thracian singer was converted.⁶⁰

In conclusion we may posit that these texts have no direct significance for our research.

We may mention further Ps.-Justin, *Cohortatio ad Graecos* 25. Strangely enough both Charles and Lohmeyer omit the prefix “Pseudo-”, even though the inauthenticity of this writing has long been established and its ascription to Justin Martyr is erroneous.⁶¹ This work is generally dated to the 3rd century, though it is difficult to be more precise as to its provenance and date.

In the chapter in question the author speaks of the famous divine revelation in Exodus 3:6: Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν (following the Septuagint).⁶² He maintains that “the Being One” does not indicate *one* time but all three, i.e. past, present and future. Plato teaches this, too, in *Timaeus* 27E–28A (cf. the discussion in ch. 20). The text then continues: διὰ τοῦτο ποίνυν, ὥσπερ ἐρμηνεύσαι τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι τὸ μυστικῶς περὶ τῆς ἀιδιότητος τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τῆς μετοχῆς εἰρημένον βουλόμενος “as Plato wrote, literally”, namely the quotation from *Leg.* IV 715E: ὁ μὲν δὴ θεός—ἔχων. “Here Plato openly and clearly mentions ‘the old saying’, the Law of Moses; though he shrank from mentioning the name of Moses for fear of the poison cup—since he knew that the Greeks hated the teaching of this man—nonetheless by indicating the antiquity of the word he is clearly referring to Moses.”

Here, then, we find the same motif as in Clement (see above), in that Plato is actually an adherent of the teaching of Moses, but dare not say so explicitly,

59 See the list of quotations in: O. Stählin, *Clemens Alexandrinus, Register*, Leipzig 1934, vol. IV 1, pp. 157–178; O. Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta*, Berlin 21963, p. 364.

60 In *Protrepticus* I 3,1 Clement calls Orpheus, among the spiritual deceivers in II 21.2 “the mystagogue as witness to shamefulness”, but in VII 74.3–6 he cites him with approval as someone who later understood that he had gone astray. Other witnesses to Orpheus’s conversion among Christian authors are found in O. Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta*, pp. 255–256.

61 On this “Cohortatio” cf. O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, Freiburg im Br. 21913, vol. I, pp. 232–236; B. Altaner & A. Stuiber, *Patrologie*, Freiburg im Br. 21966, p. 68.

62 On this “I am” see p. 160 n. 10.

merely alluding to it.⁶³ This motif is a firm feature of this writing,⁶⁴ and it may be noted that the same reason for the “reference” is to be found in Clement also.⁶⁵ But here, unlike in Clement, the emphasis does indeed lie on the definition of God, which is understandable in the framework of the designs of the unknown author, since he is interested precisely in providing evidence for monotheism. And this saying of Plato was extremely useful to him. As will become evident (see below), Christians could find allies in a certain school of the Platonists. It is, however, curious that just like Clement he interprets “the old saying” as Mosaic, but does not make a connection with an Orphic poem (see below, pp. 191–95). This is all the more remarkable because he does in fact quote this poem in ch. 15, but without those verses which Plato would have had in mind and which, to the extent that he knew them, could have provided him with a splendid “testimonium”.

In a completely different context the quotation from Plato is employed by *Methodius*, “a great reader of Plato,”⁶⁶ in *De Resurrectione* II 10.5. In that chapter he argues that the human being is a microcosm, composed of the four elements: air, earth, water and fire, which since Empedocles (5th cent. BCE) were regarded as the parts from which the cosmos was constructed. Then he points to the vision of the chariot borne by four animals in Ezekiel 1; in his view the four animals also represent the four elements, with the surprising turn: *ὁ τοῖνυν*

63 The text reads as follows: Ἐνταῦθα ὁ Πλάτων σαφῶς καὶ φανερώς τὸν παλαιὸν λόγον Μωυσέως ὀνομάζει νόμον, τοῦ μὲν ὀνόματος Μωυσέως φόβῳ τοῦ κωνείου μεμνήσθαι δεδιώς. ἡπίστατο γάρ τὴν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς διδασκαλίαν ἐχθρὰν Ἑλλήνων οὖσαν. διὰ δὲ τῆς τοῦ λόγου παλαιότητος τὴν Μωυσέα σημαίνει σαφῶς. This word σημαίνει automatically reminds the reader of the well-known saying of Heraclitus, fr. 92 concerning the Delphic oracle, the god of which οὔτε λέγει οὔτε κρύπτει ἀλλὰ σημαίνει.

64 Cf. *Cohort.* 20: Plato became acquainted with the monotheism of Moses during his stay in Egypt, but was afraid that he would have the same accusers and objections on his back as Socrates—φόβῳ τοῦ κωνείου ποικίλον τινὰ καὶ ἐσχηματισμένον τὸν περὶ θεῶν γυμνάζει λόγον. In ch. 22 this motif (Egypt–monotheism–fear of the Areopagus) is aired again in connection with *Timaeus* 27D–28A. In ch. 32 the *Meno* 99E is quoted with the introduction: (Plato) δεδιώς γὰρ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δωρεὰν πνεῦμα ἅγιον ὀνομάζειν, ἵνα μὴ δόξη τῇ τῶν προφητῶν ἐπόμενος διδασκαλίᾳ ἔχθρος Ἑλλήνων εἶναι . . . οὐ μὴν πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἀλλ’ ἀρετὴν ὀνομάζειν αὐτὸ ἡξίου.

65 Clement of Alexandria, *Protr.* VI 71.3 on Xenophon: διαρρήδην ἂν καὶ αὐτὸς περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐγγράφει τι μαρτυρῶν ὡς Σωκράτης, εἰ μὴ τὸ Σωκράτους ἐδεδίει φάρμακον. οὐδὲν δὲ ἤττον αἰνίττεται, at which point *Memorab. Socratis* IV 3.13 f. is quoted (cited also in *Strom.* V 14.108.5, but without the introduction).

66 On Methodius, cf. J. Quasten, *Patrology*, Utrecht–Anvers 1953, vol. II, pp. 129–137; Altaner–Stuiber, *op. cit.*, pp. 215–216.

θεός, ὥσπερ ὁ παλαιός φησιν λόγος, ἀρχὴν καὶ τελευτὴν καὶ μέσα τῶν ὄντων ἀπάντων ἔχων, ἀέρα καὶ γῆν, ὕδωρ τε αὖ καὶ πῦρ, τὰ μέγιστα ζῶα τῇ βουλῇ συνέχων τῇ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ διακρατῶν, καθάπερ ὄχημα τέτρωρον, πρὸς διαμονὴν εὐθύνων ἀρρήτως ἡνιοχεῖ τὸ πᾶν.

The combination of the Plato text with the Ezekiel passage thus enables him to show how God holds together the four elements from which the cosmos is constructed by His own will, controlling them as a charioteer handles his four horses; thus he guides the universe on into perpetuity.

So Methodius does not mention Plato by name, but lets Plato's words become part of his own argument. This is another indication of how well known the quotation was, since of course Methodius knew who had said it. It is interesting that this passage, which Charles and Lohmeyer do not mention, does by its context indeed give an interpretation, namely a clearly cosmological one: "beginning, end and middle" are equivalent to the four elements.

Finally it should be mentioned how *Eusebius* cites Plato's text in his *Praeparatio Evangelica*. There are three instances of this, but in *P.E.* XV 5,2 he does not give his own view but cites another, namely the philosopher Atticus. So for the moment, while we are looking into usage by Christian authors, we shall leave this text without further discussion and will return to it later.⁶⁷

a. *Praep. Ev.* XI 13; here the bishop of Caesarea is discussing monotheism. His starting point is Moses' words in Deut 6:4 (see above, p. 159 n. 2). Plato appears to agree with these, to judge from his words in *Timaeus* 31A. He too knew one God, even if he followed Greek polytheistic language, which he defended in his 13th letter. And in so many words Plato confesses, according to our author, "that he learnt the dogma about God from old (books)". The proof of this opinion is provided by *Leges* IV 715E–716B, which is cited verbatim: ὁ μὲν δὴ θεός—ἀνάστατον ἐποίησε (§5).

Now in the following paragraphs, 6–8, the reader is invited to place alongside the various parts of this pronouncement words "from Hebrew prophecy", one after the other, Isa 41:4; Ps 11:7; Deut 32:35 (Rom 12:19); 1 Thess 4:6 + Ps 31:24; Deut 13:5; Prov 3:34 (Jas 4:6; 1 Pet 5:6); Job 20:5. It is interesting to see, then, that Eusebius gives as a parallel to the threefold divine predicate the text of Isa 41:4 (following the Septuagint, of course): Ἐγὼ θεὸς πρῶτος καὶ ἐγὼ μετὰ ταῦτα. So here a "chronological" interpretation is given. To the question why

67 In *Praep. Ev.* XIII 13,16–17 Eusebius gives a quotation from Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* V 14,95,4 (see above, p. 172 n. 53); since Eusebius is not quoting independently here there is no point in discussing this text separately.

Eusebius mentioned precisely this text and not others, such as Rev 21:6, he himself answers at the end of this chapter: “these are just a few (texts) from tens of thousands about the God who is above all” (§8).

b. *Theophania* II 44:⁶⁸ “Er aber (Plato) setzte wie durch göttliche Offenbarung fest, was das immer Seiende, aber niemals Werdende und was das durch Wissen mit der Vernunft Wahrgenommene und immer sich selbst Gleiche, sei (quotations from *Timaeus* 27D), und sagte, wie weit es reiche, und redete offenkundig schön und weise eine wahrhaftige göttliche Geschichte der Natur gemäss folgendermassen”: then comes the quotation of ὁ μὲν δὴ θεός—τιμωρός from *Leg.* IV 715E–716A.

But this philosopher, Eusebius protests, did not stay in touch but, out of fear of death, fell into apostasy.⁶⁹ So here the quotation from Plato serves again as a witness that in “heathendom” the true understanding of God was known but was not expressly confessed. With the introductory words “wie weit es reiche” (how far it extends) Eusebius evidently gives a spatial interpretation of the divine predicate and draws attention to the fact that God’s justice investigates the deeds of men.

In addition to these texts, which give us an idea of how familiar this text from the *Leges* was to the early Christian authors, we may mention a few other contemporaneous “heathen” writers that register this quotation, without any attempt at providing a comprehensive list.

With these words from “the noble Plato” the unknown author of Ps.-Aristotle, *De Mundo* 7 concludes his writing as an apotheosis. The dating of this work differs widely: for some it came into being in the time of Augustus; others date it to the middle of the 2nd century; and various dates between these two extremes have been suggested.⁷⁰ But whatever the dating, the difference of opinion does not detract from the high esteem in which this text was held. The writer says that God is one, but has many names borrowed from all the vicissitudes which he inaugurates. He then gives a long list of these names,

68 Quoted from H. Gressmann, *Eusebius Theophanie, die griechischen Bruchstücke und Übersetzung der syrischen Überlieferung*, Leipzig 1904, p. 98* (English translation: “But he [Plato] established, as if by divine revelation, what was the always Being but never Becoming, and what was that perceived through knowledge by reason and always equal to itself, and said how far it extends, and spoke openly, beautifully and wisely of a true, divine history in accordance with nature, as follows”).

69 See above, p. 175 nn. 63–65.

70 A brief but clear overview of the dates is given by D.J. Furley, *Aristotle, On the Cosmos*, London – Cambridge (Mass.) 1965, pp. 339–341.

culminating with the words: “to summarize it all, the God of heaven and earth, who gives the name to everything that happens through nature or fate, since He is the cause of everything”. A number of verses borrowed from the Orphic writings (Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta*, fr. 21a) are then quoted with approval. In a broad survey the well-known problem of the relationship between God and Anangkē (the compulsive power of Fate) is discussed;⁷¹ he solves it by equating them, dealing with various names for Destiny. All this leads to the declaration which concludes and crowns the treatise as a whole: “All these things are nothing but God, as noble Plato also says,” quoting *Leges* IV 715E–716A τῖμωρός, supplemented by a short sentence from 730C, “of which (i.e. Dikē) he who is on the point of becoming blessed and happy immediately partakes”.

This treatise is provided with a Latin translation by *Apuleius*, *De Mundo* (probably mid-2nd cent.). He follows the original quite closely. In ch. 38 the sentence that introduces the quotation reads: “deum verum ire per omnes non frustra arbitrabitur, qui audiet Platonis haec verba.” The first part of this sentence is a quotation from Virgil, *Georgica* IV 221f.: “deum namque ire per omnes/terrasque tractusque maris caelumque profundum.” The Latin translation of the quotation from the *Leges* goes up to “vindex futura” (= τῖμωρός) and concludes with the words: “quam faciet ille mitificam, qui statim a tenero et ipsis incunabulis intellexit, extimuit eique se totum dedit atque permisit.”

The meaning of the divine predicate here, then, is that God penetrates everything; that even the vicissitudes of fate do not take place without Him and that human life cannot escape his judgment. The divine predicate is clearly taken in a spatial sense here and is a description of the totality of God.

Plutarch makes use of the Plato text a number of times. In his *Adv. Coloten* 30.4 the whole emphasis is on the justice of God, which punishes the wickedness of humans. Colotes said at the end of his book that the laws serve to manage peace and order in life and that if anyone were to rescind them people would lead the life of beasts. Plutarch firmly rejects this view: if we rescind the laws and abandon the teachings of the philosophers, even then we will fear shameful things, honour justice, and regard the gods as good rulers. Even if people ridicule these things, ἔστιν δίκης ὀφθαλμός, ὃς τὰ πάνθ’ ὀρᾷ and πέλας γὰρ ἔστως ὁ θεὸς ἐγγύθεν βλέπει; this is followed by the quotation from Plato to τῖμωρός. The whole emphasis, then, rests on the end of the quotation. In the context of the other texts he points people to the fact that they cannot escape God’s judgment.

71 A.J. Festugière, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, vol. II *Le Dieu cosmique*, Paris 1949, p. 510.

In *De Exilio* 5 the text makes an appearance in an odd context and with a few small variations. Plutarch waves away the misery of exile with the well-known notion that the true sage is a world citizen and can therefore never be an alien or an exile. Nature, the seasons and so on are the same everywhere, and above all there is *one* king and ruler, namely God ἀρχὴν τε καὶ μέσα καὶ τελευτὴν ἔχων τοῦ πάντος, εὐθεία περαίνει κατὰ φύσιν περιπορευόμενος. τῷ δὲ ἔπεται Δίκη τῶν ἀπολειπομένων τοῦ θείου νόμου τιμωρός, ἣ χρώμεθα πάντες ἄνθρωποι φύσει πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὥσπερ πολίτας.

The most notable thing for our subject is the fact that here Plutarch takes account of the logical sequence of the three elements of the saying and does not follow the text of Plato literally in this regard. Moreover, he has dropped the reference to “the old saying”. Here too we observe that, as was noted in another case (see above, p. 176), the quotation is not introduced as such and any reference to Plato is absent. The words are adopted in a natural way in his own argument. Is this an indication that they were so universally known that any reader would immediately know where the writer had borrowed them from? According to Babut, after mentioning the idea of world citizenship, held so dear by the Stoics, Plutarch wanted to use the quotation to underline the fact that he agrees only to a very limited degree with the position of the Stoa.⁷² If this view were correct, then it seems to me that one would have expected an explicit appeal to Plato; hence I regard this interpretation as rather too subtle.

For our topic the acceptance of this quotation by Plutarch is of significance. For him apparently this was the best way in which to describe the essence of the one king of the universe. The emphasis is laid on the dominion of God over the city-state, which is the cosmos and in which He wields his justice, which all must put into practice. It is clear that expressed in the triad *archē, mesa, teleutē* is not a sequence in time but a simultaneously existing totality: God spans the universe.

In his *Ad principem ineruditum* 5 Plutarch makes use of this text, this time expressly mentioning Plato, but omitting the phrase that is of interest to us here. It is not, he argues, appropriate that God should be mixed up in earthly material with all its subjection to coercion, vicissitudes and changes; ἀλλ’ ἡμῖν ἄνω που περὶ τὴν αἰὲ κατὰ ταῦτά οὕτω φύσιν ἔχουσαν ἰδρυμένος ἐν βάθροισι ἀγίοις, ἥ, φησι Πλάτων, εὐθέα περαίνει κατὰ φύσιν περιπορευόμενος.

This text from Plato is brought up by the Platonist *Atticus*⁷³ in the context of a discussion about the antitheses between Plato and Aristotle; it serves as

72 D. Babut, *Plutarque et le Stoïcisme*, Paris 1969, p. 106.

73 On Atticus cf. P. Merlan, in: A.H. Armstrong, *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, Cambridge 1970, pp. 73–78.

evidence for the *Pronoia* of God in the world. He then says (fr. 3 ap. Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* XV 5.2): “Plato makes a connection of all things with God, so that they are oriented towards Him and go out from Him” (εἰς θεὸν καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ πάντα ἀνάπτει. φησὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἀρχὴν τε καὶ μέσα καὶ τελευτὴν τῶν ὄντων ἀπάντων ἔχοντα εὐθείᾳ περιβαίνειν περιπορευόμενον).

To this text he connects the one from *Timaeus* 29E. Atticus thus quotes the text in indirect speech, and it is noticeable that unlike the text in Plato himself and in others who quote him, he writes down the “logical” sequence: beginning, middle, end, while elsewhere the two last elements are frequently exchanged. Moreover, he does not indicate that Plato himself makes an appeal to “the old saying”. It should also be pointed out that these two quotations from Plato are the same as that in Irenaeus (see above, p. 170f.).⁷⁴

Here, then, clearly a spatial interpretation is given to the words of Plato, since the whole discussion turns on the issue that, according to Atticus, Aristotle saw the divine sphere of influence as extending only to the moon, while the rest of the universe remained outside divine control. No, says Atticus, according to Plato God has everything in hand and strides across everything; there is nothing that falls outside His care.

That this text played a part in the doctrinal discussions of the Platonists is also evident from the *Doxography* which Hippolytus took up as the first book of his *Refutatio* §19.⁷⁵ A survey of Plato’s teachings is given there, with the observation that among the Platonists there is a difference of opinion on the question whether the Master was a monotheist or a polytheist:⁷⁶ τὸν δὲ θεὸν οἱ μὲν ἓνα φασὶν αὐτὸν εἰπεῖν ἀγέννητον καὶ ἀφθαρτον, “as he (Plato) says in ‘the Laws,’” and then follows the text of ὁ μὲν δὴ τοῦ ἀπάντων ἔχων, followed as a conclusion by: οὕτως ἓνα αὐτὸν τὸν διὰ πάντων κεχωρηκότα ἀποφαίνεται.

The emphasis, therefore, in this connection lies on the singular that Plato uses, as in the conclusion ἓνα αὐτόν. The interpretation makes a local, not temporal impression (κεχωρηκότα = is spread). The eternity of God is already expressed in the preceding “unbecome and incorruptible” and that attribute of God (gods) was not a point of difference between the Platonists.

74 I have dealt with this remarkable agreement in my article “Two Notes on Irenaeus, a) Irenaeus and Atticus Platonicus,” forthcoming in *Vigiliae Christianae* 30 (1976).

75 This is also included by H. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*, Berlin 1879; since a controversy among the Platonists is recorded here, and not a personal view of Hippolytus’s, this text should not be classed among the Christian testimonia, as is the case in Charles and Lohmeyer (see above, p. 167 n. 39).

76 It was with this group of Platonists, who adhered to a monotheistic interpretation, that the Christians associated.

Finally, we should note the use of this text made by *Celsus* in his polemic against the Christian faith (ap. Origen, *contra Celsum* VI 15). The Greek gentleman was annoyed by the practice of penitence that was current among the Christians; in his view it was indecorous to humiliate oneself by prostrating oneself in sackcloth and ashes. His assessment was that the Christians had misunderstood Plato's words (ταπεινός και κεκοσμημένος). Origen points out that the root of Christian humility does not lie in Plato but in Scripture (Ps 131:1, 2; 1 Pet 5:6) and in the teaching of Christ (Phil 2:6–8; Matt 11:29). Celsus gives the quotation, ὁ μὲν δὴ—κεκοσμημένος, but the emphasis is entirely on the last words. The difference between him and the Christians rests very characteristically in the different understanding of ταπεινός (see above, p. 173).

This controversy is of interest in that it shows how well known this Plato text was and how it could be the sole link for Celsus in explaining the peculiar practice of the Christians, the assumption being that the latter took their inspiration from Plato. It is possible that in defending their view of *tapeinophrosunē* (humility) the Christians did indeed appeal to Plato, because, after all, the connection is made there with “following God”. But we would then have to infer this from this text, because I am not aware of any other text that provides proof of it.

Be that as it may, this text does not say anything significant about the divine predicate, as the Plato text is mentioned only in passing, as a way of explaining the strange behaviour of the Christians.

From the overview offered here⁷⁷ it seems that the passage from Plato, *Leg.* IV 715E–716, enjoyed considerable interest from both Christian and non-Christian authors in the first centuries of our era. The words of the founder of the Academy were adapted for use for a variety of purposes.

The words played a part in the discussions among Platonists on the question whether the Master had taught one God or multiple gods, and thus automatically attracted attention. This was a *locus probans* for a monotheistic view. From the remarkable agreement between Atticus and Irenaeus (see above, pp. 170, 179–80) we may reasonably infer that this text was taken up in a doxography.⁷⁸ This may also be indicated by the fact that writers almost always begin with the words ὁ μὲν δὴ θεός without taking account of the broader relation to the context in Plato. Evidently this passage was so well known—one might say, proverbial?—that various authors could borrow words from it without mentioning their source.

77 This overview is not comprehensive; Proclus, for instance, is not included. For present purposes it did not seem necessary to go further than the time of Eusebius.

78 See my article mentioned in n. 74, p. 180.

The overview also reveals that the various authors who have appeared in our parade did not make a uniform use of this quotation from Plato's oeuvre. It is not the case that in all instances the preaching of God is given full emphasis. In many cases the accent is precisely on the warning against transgressors of God's commandments that is contained in this text; the statement about God serves to add weight to the warning, just as in later centuries Christian preachers of repentance endeavoured to frighten their audience onto the right track with threats of punishment in hell.

If we then direct our attention to the divine predicate we see that this is always formulated as: ἀρχὴν τε καὶ τελευτὴν καὶ μέσα τῶν ὄντων ἀπάντων ἔχων, occasionally given with the more logical sequence, "beginning, middle and end". But even in this reordering, the words τελευτή and μέσα are still used. As far as the construction ἔχων + *accusativi objecti* is concerned, there are no variations. For our continuing investigation it will certainly be important to bear in mind the consistency in the wording of this quotation from Plato.

If we ask as to the significance that these users of the quotation attached to the divine predicate, it is evident that the words of the formula are taken in a cosmological sense: this God has dominion over the universe; nothing escapes Him, because he pervades everything in accordance with His nature. For clarity the meaning might also be described in negative terms: with a single exception (see p. 177) this has nothing to do with a definition of the eternity of God.

In conclusion we may note that what we have here is the interpretation and application of a quotation from Plato. Clement of Alexandria and Ps.-Justin certainly wondered what the meaning might be of the allusion to "the old saying", and gave it a meaning that was in tune with their general apologetic interests, namely a discreet reference to the Mosaic law. But Plato's text itself did not give any cause to follow this up. Be that as it may, people listen to the authoritative philosopher of the Academy with respect; *his* words are accepted and used. We must note this quite clearly in connection with our subject, since from the observations of Charles and Lohmeyer quoted above one might gain the impression that in these texts we hear *independent* witnesses to the use of the divine predicate. Such is *not* the case, because one can hear the echo of Plato's resonant voice.

III

In the list of Plato quotations given above should we have also included the words of Josephus in *c. Apionem* II 190, mentioned above on p. 265. In posing this question we come back to what is our real topic. Almost a century

and a half ago Lobeck answered this question in the affirmative, in his famous book *Aglaophamus*,⁷⁹ because after citing the text of *Leg.* IV 715E and quoting a scholiast on this passage, he continues, “Sententiam illam sequi non dedignatus est Josephus”, referring to this passage.⁸⁰ I have not followed up whether Lobeck had precursors who took this view; but he certainly found followers. It would be safe to say that wherever the topic “God: beginning and end” is raised, his view can be heard. I will mention only the statement of Otto Weinreich: “Auf den Gott der Juden wendet Josephus die Formel an”⁸¹ and the reference by Gerhard Dellings,⁸² who mentions these passages from Plato and Josephus in one breath.

But a number of issues immediately arise. Did Josephus indeed use Plato at this point, where there is no indication of borrowing or quotation (see the full text, p. 186 below)? It has already become evident from the overview given earlier that other authors too omit to indicate their sources, even where the terminology used can leave no possible doubt as to where the source lies. So essentially there is no difficulty to this; the words of Plato can have already been so well known that Josephus, assuming that he drew on Plato directly, had no need to signal the borrowing explicitly.

It may also be assumed that the sentence that Plato introduces as “the old saying” was in circulation on its own. For reasons that we shall discuss later, it could have come from Orphic circles. Did Josephus recognize it as such? The possibility cannot be ruled out *a priori*. Why, like his coreligionist Aristobulus (see below pp. 195–96) and later Christian apologists, should he not have been able to use “Orpheus” as a witness to monotheism? If scholars have believed it possible to show traces of Orphic influence in a community as closed as that of

79 On the author of this famous book, C.A. Lobeck (1781–1860) see L. Zscharnack in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Tübingen 21929, vol. III, col. 1702.

80 C.A. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus, drei Bücher über die Grundlagen der Mysterienreligion der Griechen mit einer Sammlung der Fragmente der orphischen Dichter*, Königsberg (Kaliningrad) 1829 (repr. Darmstadt 1961), vol. I, p. 530.

81 “Josephus applies the formula to the God of the Jews”: O. Weinreich in his very important essay, “Aion in Eleusis,” *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 19 (1916–1919), p. 180 (repr. in O. Weinreich, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, Amsterdam 1969, vol. I, pp. 442–461; the page references of the original publication are also given here). In this reference I follow the pagination of the first publication.

82 Cf. G. Dellings, ἀρχή, in: Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. I, p. 478, n. 6; so too Charles and Lohmeyer (above, p. 162 n. 21), but not in Kern, *Orph. Fragm.*

Qumran,⁸³ then it is certainly conceivable that such a well-travelled person as Josephus would have been familiar with it.

But whatever the possibilities, the fact is that Josephus never makes any mention of Orpheus, not even in passages in his apology against Apion, where he could easily have done so. In any case we must acknowledge that if this saying derives from Orphic circles at all, Josephus does not notice it.

The most important question, however, lies in the wording, because in Josephus this differs in three respects from Plato: (a) Plato has τελευτήν, Josephus τέλος; (b) Plato presents the sequence “beginning, end, middle”, while Josephus gives the more “logical” order; (c) in Plato, “God *has* beginning, etc. and middle of all things”, in Josephus “God *is* beginning etc.” Gruppe and Zeller⁸⁴ pointed out long ago that the wording is not identical, but as far as I am aware this attention to the difficulty has not led to closer investigation of the questions this raises. There is no way around the discrepancy, however, because if, as is often done, we draw a direct line from the quotation in Plato to the Apocalypse of John the same question immediately arises. Can one dispose of the point of difference given under (c) above, as the outstanding Orphism expert Guthrie does, by simply writing, “Zeus is or holds the beginning, the middle and the end of all”,⁸⁵ regardless of the further question whether this expression is grammatically correct?

It is strange that in discussions of our subject it is always simply stated that Josephus says that God is the beginning, middle and end, and then makes a connection with the famous text of Plato, but that no one has reflected on the connection in which Josephus uses this divine predicate, the reason why this happens and the historical environment in which he is writing.

83 This is indeed sometimes thought to be the case in relation to the description of David in Psalm 151, the Hebrew text of which has been found in Qumran; see J.P.M. van der Ploeg, in his discussion in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 23 (1966), pp. 134–135, which speaks of “une influence indirecte”. However, the first editor of the Psalms Scroll, J.A. Sanders, wrote expressly in a later publication (*The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, Ithaca – New York 1967, p. 98): “In any event, please note that no suggestion has been made from any quarter that Orphic thinking in any way affected the essential theology of the Essenes at Qumran.”

84 O. Gruppe, “Die rhapsodische Theogonie und ihre Bedeutung innerhalb der orphischen Literatur,” *Besonderer Ausdruck aus dem siebzehnten Supplementbände der Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, Leipzig 1890, pp. 704–705; E. Zeller, *De Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Leipzig 1919, pt. 1, section 1, 1st half, p. 68 n. 3: “Doch darf man nicht übersehen, dass Platons Zitat nicht genau passt”, after having first indicated what would argue in favour of this.

85 W.K.C. Guthrie, *Orpheus and Greek Religion*, London 1952, p. 24 n. 5.

At this point it seems appropriate to make a methodological *Zwischenbemerkung*. Above I already pointed out the cryptic way in which G. Kittel dealt with this formula. How can he simply state that in Josephus it is a Palestinian “aber offenkundig nicht bodenständige, sondern übernommene Form”?⁸⁶ Can one simply ascribe everything that Josephus writes, as he writes it, as something from Palestine, and even if that is possible, what does that mean? We already observed how Charles and Lohmeyer list all sorts of texts without making it clear that the same Plato quotation is concerned in each case and what these texts contribute to the illumination of the problem of Rev 21:6. This is how it is in Otto Weinreich’s article too, the most extensive treatment given to the formula to date.⁸⁷ He assembled a large number of places where ἀρχή—τελευτή/τέλος occur together with or without μέσα, with an assurance that he had more than these in reserve.⁸⁸ But he threw it all together too easily into a single box; differences in wording were explained away too readily; witnesses originating from very different times and places are quickly combined, and this historian of religion, despite his extensive wealth of knowledge, does too little justice to the historical connections *and* differences. I am fully aware that the study of many historical questions in the religions of antiquity is so difficult because the data are often scarce and the accounts fragmentary and often not contemporaneous, dating from much later times. But these difficulties must not lead us to lose sight of the chronological fixations, where ascertainable, and work with “updating”.⁸⁹ In the following discussion we aim to keep an eye firmly on the time factor and the context and not work

86 “... but clearly not home-grown but borrowed form”: Kittel, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 1 n. 4.

87 See n. 81.

88 Weinreich, *op. cit.*, p. 180 n. 1.

89 The pseudepigraphal character of the writings that bear the name of Orpheus is an established fact. M.P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, Munich ²1955, vol. I, p. 680, is correct when he writes: “Es bleibt also oft zweifelhaft, was orphisch in strengerem Sinn genannt werden soll”, and further: “der beste Kenner der orphischen Literatur, KERN, ist jetzt zu der Ansicht gekommen, dass die rhapsodische Theogonie nicht lange vor den Neuplatonikern, die sie zitieren, verfasst wurde”. This state of affairs should always be borne in mind, especially as, of course, a certain suggestion emerges from such an outstanding collection as Kern’s *Fragmenta Orphica*. But the fact that a particular statement is given there does not in itself say anything about its high antiquity. “Alles deutet darauf, dass die orphischen Schriften sich in einem fliessenden Zustand befanden” (Nilsson, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 680). It can certainly not be assumed that every text in this collection comes from the period before Plato.

with vague terminology such as “überkommenes Gut”,⁹⁰ under which rubric data from widely disparate provenances are all too conveniently summarized.

Now how does the divine predicate come to be mentioned in this particular passage in Josephus?

In his demonstration of the exalted status of the structure of the Jewish state he points out that among his people the devotion to God is not limited to a few days as in the mysteries, but embraces one's entire life.⁹¹ The first of the special consecration formulas⁹² is about God and says the following: θεὸς ἔχει τὰ σύμπαντα παντελὴς καὶ μακάριος, αὐτὸς αὐτῷ καὶ πᾶσιν αὐτάρκης, ἀρχὴ καὶ μέσα καὶ τέλος οὗτος τῶν πάντων, ἔργοις μὲν καὶ χάρισιν ἐνάργης καὶ πάντος οὐτινος φανερώτερος, μορφὴν δὲ καὶ μέγεθος ἡμῖν ἄφατος (§190). No image can or may be made of him. His works are the natural phenomena such as sun and moon, earth and sea etc., which God created without the assistance of others,⁹³ but in accordance with His will.⁹⁴ One must serve this God by practising virtue; this form of service is the most sacred (§191–192).

Before moving on to a discussion of this allusion to the nature of God it will be good to note that Josephus has already spoken of this in another place, namely in *c. Apionem* II 167. Here he argued that the Jewish form of government is a theocracy:⁹⁵ God is the origin (αἴτιον) of everything good for all humanity, and Moses revealed this God as One, καὶ ἀγέννητον καὶ πρὸς τὸν αἰῶδιον χρόνον ἀναλλοίωτον, πάσης ιδέας θνητῆς ἀλλεὶ διαφέροντα, καὶ δυνάμει μὲν ἡμῖν γινώριμον, ὁποῖος δὲ κατ' οὐσίαν ἐστὶν ἄγνωστον. This view of God was also, according to Josephus, that of practically all the best Greek philosophers, among whom he lists the names of Pythagoras, Anaxagoras, Plato and the Stoa; however,

90 “Transmitted material”; so e.g. Lohmeyer in his article in T. Klauser, *Reallexikon*, vol. I, col. 2, which lists in quick succession: the Old Testament, Orphic literature, Judaism (in which context he mentions this Josephus text) and Mandaean literature.

91 I hope shortly to publish an article on “Josephus and the mysteries” elsewhere.

92 This seems to me to be the correct translation of προρρήσις at this point; in my article mentioned in the previous note I revisit this.

93 T. Reinach, *op. cit.*, p. 92 n. 4, sees polemic here, no doubt correctly, although I doubt where this was directly specially to Philo. On the basis of the plural in Gen 1:26, “Let Us make man”, it has often been thought that the reference here is to God and assistants.

94 Cf. Rev 4:11: σὺ ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα, καὶ διὰ τὸ θέλημά σου ἦσαν καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν.

95 In contrast to the state forms among other peoples, such as monarchy, oligarchy or democracy (*c. Apionem* II 164–165). This reference to the Jewish state structure as a “theocracy” is, as is generally known, a speciality of Josephus; see below, p. 187 n. 97.

the latter did not dare to disseminate the truth in public (§166–169).⁹⁶ In the context of the present study it is neither possible nor necessary to analyse these texts in detail, however desirable such a study would be in its own right. But a few remarks do need to be made about this in order to see the use that Josephus makes of the divine predicate in the right perspective. It is not sufficient simply to state *that* the Jewish author uses it; the question is how and why he does this.

In the assessment of this confession by Josephus it needs to be borne in mind that he is trying to reach a particular objective, namely the acceptance by right-minded heathens of the peculiar Jewish form of government and life-style, which in the ancient world were the target of attacks precisely because of their striking peculiarity. He therefore forged⁹⁷ the word “theocracy”, because this puts God in central place. If he wanted to demonstrate its respectability, he had to show who God was and why He is so exalted.

In comparing the two passages quoted, it is striking that they display agreement in the conclusion. Using different wording, they both express the idea that this God is in essence unknowable, but he can be known in His works. This idea is not specific to Josephus, but is frequently found in the world of his day. The words of Paul are commonly known: “Ever since the creation of the world his eternal power and divine nature, invisible though they are, have been understood and seen through the things he has made” (Rom 1:20). Precisely in connection with the latter text, a very important one from a dogmatic point of view too, a large amount of material has been assembled illustrating the wide dissemination of this idea in the religious life of Hellenistic times and during the period of the Roman Empire.⁹⁸ Two quotations may be offered as

96 Here we thus also find the idea, which later occurs among various Christian authors (see above, p. 175), though one might wonder what is the precise meaning of the words τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ δόγματος ἐξενεγκεῖν οὐκ ἐτόλμησαν. When it comes to this expression “dare not” does one need to supply “for fear of being sentenced to death” (see that motif mentioned above, p. 175), or is the emphasis on the ἐξενεγκεῖν in the sense of “reveal to the uninitiated” (cf. O. Casel, *De philosophorum graecorum silentio mystico*, Giessen 1919, p. 161 s.v. ἐκφέρειν, with references to numerous passages proving this usage)? Personally I am inclined to accept the latter interpretation; in my study mentioned in n. 91 above this will be further substantiated.

97 In c. *Apionem* II 165 Josephus writes: ὡς δ' ἂν τις εἴποι βιασάμενος τὸν λόγον and glosses the term with the words θεῶ τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τὸ κράτος ἀναθεῖς.

98 An overview of texts in which this idea is expressed can be found in Wettstein, *Novum Testamentum*, II, pp. 22–23; E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, Leipzig 1913, pp. 24–28; H. Lietzmann, *An die Römer*, Tübingen 31928, pp. 31–32.

examples: Ps.-Xenophon, ap. Stobaeus II, p. 15 Wachsmuth: ὡς μὲν μέγας τις καὶ δυνατός, φανερός. ὁποῖος δὲ τὴν μορφήν, ἀφανής—Ps.-Aristotle, *De Mundo* 6: πασῇ θνητῇ φύσει γενόμενος ἀθεώρητος ἀπ’ αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων θεωρεῖται. Festugière has very rightly shown that Josephus stands in a particular philosophical tradition in making this distinction between knowledge of the existence of God and ignorance concerning the being or the form of God, thereby championing a view that was not shared by all other thinkers.⁹⁹

In relation to the other statements about God that Josephus makes here, also, it is clear that he makes use of terminology familiar to his non-Jewish contemporaries. A small selection from many such texts follows, which speak for themselves:

Albinus, *Epitome* 10.3–4 καὶ μὴν ὁ πρῶτος θεὸς αἰδιδίος ἐστίν, ἄρρητος, αὐτοτελής, ... ἀειτελής, τουτέστιν αἰεὶ τέλειος, παντελής, τουτέστι πάντη τέλειος ... παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ αἴτιος ὧν ... ἄρρητος δ’ ἐστὶ καὶ νῦ μόνῳ ληπτός, ὡς εἴρηται, ἐπεὶ οὔτε γένος ἐστὶν οὔτε εἶδος, οὔτε διαφορά.

Apuleius, *De Platone et eius dogmate* I 5: “Sed haec de Deo sentit (Plato), quod sit incorporeus. Is unus, ait, ἀπερίμετρος, rerumque genitor, rerumque omnium exornator, beatus et beatificus, optimus, nihil indigens, ipse conferens cuncta. Quem quidem celestem pronuntiat indicatum, innominabilem, et, ut ait ipse, ἄρρητον, ἀδάμαστον ...”

Antipater Stoicus, ap. Plutarch, *De Stoic. Repugn.* 38: Θεὸν τοίνυν νοοῦμεν ζῶν μακάριον καὶ ἄφθαρτον καὶ εὐποιοιτικὸν ἀνθρώπων.

Plutarch, *De E apud Delphos* 19: τί οὖν ὄντως ὄν ἐστι; τὸ αἰδίδιον καὶ ἀγέννητον καὶ ἄφθαρτον, ᾧ χρόνος μεταβολὴν οὐδὲ εἰς ἐπάγει.

Plutarch, *De comm. opin. adv. Stoicos* 31: τίς γάρ ἐστιν ἄλλος ἀνθρώπων ἢ γένονεν, ὃς οὐκ ἄφθαρτον νοεῖ καὶ αἰδίδιον τὸ θεῖον;

Athenagoras, *Supplicatio* 4.1: τὸ μὲν γὰρ θεῖον ἀγέννητον εἶναι καὶ αἰδίδιον, νῦ μόνῳ καὶ λόγῳ θεωρούμενον ... 22.5: τὸ δὲ θεῖον καὶ ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀκίνητον καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον (the Christian apologist is here formulating generally acceptable views that might be useful to him as arguments); cf. earlier.

Aristides, *Apol.* 4.1: God ὃς ἐστὶν ἄφθαρτός τε καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος καὶ ἀόρατος.

99 A.J. Festugière, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, vol. IV, *Le Dieu inconnu et la Gnose*, Paris 1954, pp. 6–17. He does deal with Josephus *c. Apionem* II 167 on pp. 8–9 but leaves *c. Apionem* II 190 out of consideration, even though this passage presents a splendid parallel.

Philo, *De Virt.* 9: ἔστι γὰρ ὁ μὲν θεὸς ἀνεπιδήξ, οὐθενὸς χρεῖος ὢν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς αὐταρκέστατος ἑαυτῷ.

De Cherub. 46: God ἱκανὸς γὰρ μόνος καὶ αὐταρκέστατος ἑαυτῷ.¹⁰⁰

At the time, Festugière dealt in detail with the quoted texts from Albinus and Apuleius with a number of others of their contemporaries in a chapter entitled: “La doctrine platonicienne de la transcendance divine au II^e siècle”.¹⁰¹ He did not, however, give consideration to the passages from Josephus mentioned above. Strictly speaking this was of course justified, since Josephus lived in the 1st century, but in terms of substance the Jewish apologist really belongs in this company. The terminology he uses is clearly that of the Platonic religious philosophy of the time of the Empire, combined with Stoic elements. In view of his own declaration in *c. Apionem* II 169 he was aware of this. The fact that he sought to link himself with it shows once more how widespread and popular this current was; in this regard this testimony of Josephus is also of importance for the history of philosophy at the end of the 1st century CE.

Does this also mean, then, that this historian and apologist of Judaism adopted this philosophical conception of God? Has this come to take the place of the “God of the Fathers”? In my opinion one should not be too hasty to draw this conclusion, but continue to bear in mind the goal that Josephus had in view (see above, p. 164). He could only count on serious attention to this Theocracy if his readers “recognized” the God of Israel. Josephus was convinced that it was possible to say of the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob what the greatest Greek philosophers had said about *To Theion*. What Plato and others said in somewhat obscure terms so as not to disillusion the masses—this is what Moses openly proclaimed.

It is in this environment of the religious philosophy of Middle Platonism that we find the divine predicate that we are examining. It is notable that an illustration can be found for all the sayings about God employed by Josephus in the texts cited, but not for this formula, ἀρχὴ καὶ μέσα καὶ τέλος τῶν πάντων. Striking too is the use of the word οὗτος. Given this fact and the established context one must assume that Josephus is taking up a formula current in the school and saying: “this solemn statement applies to Israel’s God

100 The other epithets can also be illustrated with texts from Philo; for this see H.A. Wolfson, *Philo*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1948, vol. II, pp. 94–164: “The Unknowability of God and Divine Predicates”.

101 A.J. Festugière, *op. cit.*, vol. IV, pp. 92–140.

(οὐτος)!¹⁰² It is not made clear precisely where he found this, but the saying was apparently current, and sufficiently familiar for it to be fully suitable for the discussion of the exaltation of Israel's God at this point. Did it come from the "consecrations" (τελεταί)? Or should we think of Pythagoras, who is also named in §169?¹⁰³

The latter possibility should certainly not be dismissed out of hand, because later a connection between this formula and the Pythagoreans will come under discussion (see below, pp. 197–98 ff.).

Be that as it may, it is in any case necessary as we pick up on a number of special features with which we began this part of our discussion (see p. 184), to point out a notable fact, namely that this passage about God begins with the declaration: "God *has* all things", while later on it is said that "He *is* the beginning, middle and end of all things" (note also the difference between τὰ σύμπαντα and τῶν πάντων). In the light of the discrepancy, noted earlier, with the famous passage in Plato it is not without significance to put a finger on

102 On this οὐτος see E. Norden, *op. cit.*, pp. 176–201, who includes the statements thereby introduced among the "unhellenische Formeln" (pp. 183ff.). But it is of course a big question whether this distinction is relevant before the time of Josephus.

103 It may serve a purpose to indicate here the other points at which Josephus mentions Pythagoras. Alongside the text in *c. Apionem* II 168 he notes this respected Greek philosopher three more times in this apology and once in the *Antiquitates*:

(1) *c. Apion.* I 14, alongside Perecydes and Thales among the sages who philosophized about celestial and divine things and who were generally regarded as disciples of the Egyptians and Chaldaeans; the Greeks regard their writings as the oldest, but they are sceptical concerning their authenticity.

(2) *c. Apion.* I 162, 165. Pythagoras, who is considered to excel all others in wisdom and piety, not only had knowledge of Jewish affairs, but put them energetically into practice (ζηλωτής αὐτῶν); no writing of his is preserved, but the meticulous historian Hermippos (3rd cent. BCE) wrote, in relation to a particular history which was connected with the death of a student of Pythagoras, that the philosopher did and said this following the views of the Jews and Thracians, which he applied to himself. Josephus adds to this quotation that it is rightly said that the man adopted many of the Jewish customs in his philosophy (see the references in the note by T. Reinach, *op. cit.*, p. 32 n. 3).

(3) *c. Apion.* II 14. His opponent Apion, though he is a grammarian, does not even know the birthplace of Homer and Pythagoras (see the note by T. Reinach, *op. cit.*, p. 115), but the liar maintains that he is precisely informed about the much older Moses.

(4) *Ant. Jud.* XIV 371 on the Essenes, who put into practice the lifestyle introduced to the Greeks by Pythagoras.

Evident from these texts is the esteem in which Josephus held Pythagoras and the agreement that he thought obtained between the Jewish and Pythagorean views, though of course for the Jewish apologist Pythagoras was the recipient party.

these two statements, found alongside one another, pointing to different statements about the “universe”.

How Josephus understood this sacred formula is unfortunately unclear from this passage. It is, however, evident that in the late 1st century it was a saying that carried weight.

IV

Although no direct connection can be made between the use of Josephus’s and Plato’s words in *Leges* IV 715E–716A, as was the case with the texts dealt with under section III, still it is necessary to make a number of observations in relation to these words of the Athenian philosopher. For one thing, so far we have not discussed the fact that Plato does not simply (*sit venia verbo!*) write down his own opinion in the text but quotes a *παλαιὸς λόγος*.

The answer to the question of what is meant by this reference is not difficult or controversial, since all are agreed that this represents a quotation from an Orphic writing.

In the *Phaedo* Plato also says: *παλαιὸς μὲν ἔστι τις λόγος*, mentioning the transmigration of souls (70C). In other passages (*Phaedo* 67C; 69C) he notes what is said or alluded to *πάλαι*, clearly having the Orphic mysteries in mind.¹⁰⁴ In as many words a scholiast signaled at the above-mentioned place in the *Leges*, that this is a quotation from an Orphic work, beginning with the words: *Ζεὺς ἀρχή, Ζεὺς μέσσα, Διὸς δ’ ἐκ πάντα τέτυκται*.¹⁰⁵ He then gives the following explanation, that “God” means the creator (demiurge) and *ἀρχή* must be taken as the creative cause (*ποιητικὸν αἴτιον*), *τελευτή* as perfecting (*τελικόν*), while *μέσσα* relates to “equally present in everything, although everything participates in him in a different way” (*ἐξ ἴσου πᾶσι παρών, καὶ πάντα διαφόρως αὐτοῦ μετέχει*).

The text of the poem meant here by the scholiast is first found in a more extensive form, also with the indication that it is found in the Orphica, in Ps.-Aristotle, *De Mundo* 7 (the Latin translation of Apuleius, ch. 37 also presents the Greek text). There we hear the beginning of a hymn of praise to Zeus, who is everything, thus:

104 On the relation between Plato and Orphism see M.J. Lagrange, *Introduction à l’étude du Nouveau Testament*, IV, *Les Mystères: l’Orphisme*, Paris 21937, pp. 165–175.

105 In Kern, *Orph. Fragm.*, p. 91 following upon the text of Plato in fr. 21; see also fr. 21a with somewhat altered versions. There are different variants for the word *τέτυκται*, as is clear from Kern’s note on p. 92 n. 6 (see below).

Ζεὺς πρῶτος γένετο, Ζεὺς ὕστατος ἀργικέραυνος·
 Ζεὺς κεφαλὴ, Ζεὺς μέσσα· Διὸς δ' ἕκ πάντα τέτυκται

etc.

In the version of *De Mundo* this poem comprises 9 verses, in the rendering by Porphyry 32 verses.¹⁰⁶ It was extremely well known in Late Antiquity and the Neo-Platonist Proclus in particular made extensive use of it.¹⁰⁷ Since we are not studying the Orphic literature in the context of this paper, we will leave the relationships between the various traditions of this poem out of our discussion. We shall draw attention to just one point only, one which is of direct significance for our subject.

In the texts printed above, the last word of the line that is of interest to our study is τέτυκται. But precisely this word is variously transmitted in different versions, such as πέλονται (in Plutarch, *De def. orac.* 48; in the *Commun. not.* 31 however he gives τέτυκται), πέφυκε (in Proclus, *Theol. Plat.* VI 8) etc. Kern provides a survey of these,¹⁰⁸ but opts for a conjecture by Diels, which he also adopted in the text of his fragment 21a (= *De Mundo* 7), namely τελεῖται “e coniectura, quam comprobavit Schol. Galani cod. Parisini bibl. nat. Suppl. gr. 634 ed. Helmreich *Ansbacher Progr.* 1910, 30”. The question of course then arises whether this conjecture is correct. It is particularly attractive, because then we indeed have the triad which runs parallel to Plato’s, “beginning, middle and end”. And that there is a manuscript of a Scholiast that confirms it is entirely splendid. But it could of course be the case that the learned scholiast already felt the same difficulty as Diels and found an equally clever solution to that of the great Berliner. In any case we must note that the checkered ancient tradition with all its variations precisely does not offer this rather obvious reading. *Rebus sic stantibus* it seems to me inadvisable to adopt Diels’s guess for now, since, after all, the transmitted text, whatever ancient tradition one follows, makes good sense. And then the very parallelism with the word τελευτή (or in other forms of the triad: τέλος) is absent.

More difficulties, moreover, arise. In the first place the question must be asked, what value may and must be placed on the scholiast’s testimony to Plato. Strangely enough, as far as I am aware, this question has never been raised. People seem so happy with this explanation, which seems to fit so exactly, that his explanation is simply accepted. From what period does this scholion in fact derive? Can it really be made plausible that it comes from the time before the composition of *De Mundo*? Or might it not be that a learned Byzantine, who

106 See Kern, *Orph. Fragm.*, fr. 21a and 168.

107 See the material in Kern, *Orph. Fragm.*, pp. 203–205.

108 Kern, *Orph. Fragm.*, p. 92 n. 6.

also knew this widely disseminated poem (see above), thought of it and used it to gloss the Plato quotation?

Personally I am inclined for now to answer the latter question in the affirmative. This then means that we must free ourselves from the suggestion that emerges from the testimonia collections of Lobeck and Kern and acknowledge that we do not necessarily have before us an authentic fact, say from 5th-century BCE Athens, but a learned explanation from a later (which?) time. Now here we have to be careful to distinguish between two things: it is perfectly possible that the scholiast was correct in his interpretation of the words παλαιὸς λόγος in Plato,¹⁰⁹ but this does not imply that one has to follow him in the view that this verse, Ζεὺς ἀρχὴ καὶ was also Plato's *Vorlage*. After all, this is exactly where a following question arises.

Can one say that Plato's statement that "God *has* the beginning, end and middle of all things" is identical in meaning to the verse that "Zeus *is* the head (var. beginning) and middle, that everything *came into being* out of Zeus"? Here we have the same question as with the comparison between Plato and Josephus (see p. 184). But one cannot interpret the word "has" in Plato as "comprises in himself" = "is," because it is clear that the sum of all things, of which God has the beginning, end and middle, is conceived of as an object alongside God, whose boundaries and content are indicated, and that he strides through.

Furthermore, Lagrange has correctly pointed out that *Dikē* does not occur in *De Mundo* at all. He writes quite correctly, but cautiously: "Ce qui prouve bien que Platon a employé le vers très libéralement—s'il l'a connu—c'est que le Pseudo-Aristote ne fait aucune place à la justice".¹¹⁰ And it is precisely this *Dikē* associated with this God that is the important thing to Plato, as is also apparent from the "application" that he gives of "the old saying". That for the Orphics *Dikē* was closely connected with Zeus, is also evident from other witnesses.¹¹¹

For all these reasons it seems to me rather unconvincing that Plato had this poem, preserved in *De Mundo* 7 and elsewhere, in front of him as he wrote *Leges* IV 715C–716A. It becomes completely impossible if the dating of this poem given by Zeller and followed by Festugière,¹¹² i.e. not before Stoicism,

109 This is also stamped as "Orphic" in *De Mundo* 7 and in the anonymous *Vit. Arat.*, cited in Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, I, p. 531.

110 M.J. Lagrange, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

111 See in Kern, *Orph. Fragm.*, fr. 23 and 159.

112 E. Zeller, "Zur Vorgeschichte des Christentums, Essener und Orphiker," in: *Kleine Schriften*, Berlin 1910, vol. II, p. 153: "äusserst unwahrscheinlich, dass dieses Werk vor dem Anfang, ja es ist kaum anzunehmen, dass es vor der Mitte des dritten Jahrhunderts v. Chr. verfasst ist"; cf. also pp. 158–159 (the essay was first published in 1899); A.J. Festugière, *Révélation*, vol. II, *Le Dieu cosmique*, p. 510 n. 5.

is correct. In my opinion their arguments are persuasive. But this conclusion does not of course exclude the possibility that Plato used an Orphic text, but if so we know of it only through him and not from elsewhere.

Or is there some other Orphic treatise from which it could have been borrowed? There is a famous poem, transmitted in four versions, namely by Pseudo-Justin, Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius and in the so-called Tübingen Theosophy (from the late 5th century CE).¹¹³ The striking and intriguing thing about this is that Eusebius does not speak of this text *auctoritate sua*, but as part of an excerpt from a work by a Jewish writer, Aristobulus. In the text given by (Aristobulus) Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* XIII 12, we read in vv. 33ff.: . . . ἔστι δὲ πάντη/αὐτὸς ἐπουράνιος καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ πάντα τελευτᾷ, /ἀρχὴν αὐτὸς ἔχων καὶ μέσσην ἣδὲ τελευτήν, /ὥς λόγος ἀρχαίων, ὡς ὕλογενῆς¹¹⁴ διέταξεν, /ἐκ θεόθεν γνῶμησι λαβὼν κατὰ δίπλακα θεσμόν.

In Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* V 14.124.1, which claims to be quoting Orpheus's own words,¹¹⁵ the text of the verse concerned reads identically, but it omits the two following verses. In the Tübingen Theosophy they are present,¹¹⁶ but the verse—here no. 40—reads thus: ἀρχὴν αὐτὸς ἔχων, ἥ δ' αὖ μέσον ἥ δὲ τελευτήν.

At this point we cannot enter into the highly complicated relationships between these various versions; for this we refer to the latest full treatment of this question by Walter.¹¹⁷ With him, we would point out that in the verses ὡς λόγος ἀρχαίων κτλ we find an interpolation which clearly refers to Plato, *Leges* IV 715E–716A, interpreting the latter as a borrowing from Moses (see above, p. 174). It is odd that this is missing in Clement's version, even though this

113 All the parallel texts are printed and provided with explanatory material by Kern, *Orph. Fragm.*, pp. 255–265; the so-called Tübingen Theosophy was first published by K. Buresch, *Klaros, Untersuchungen zum Orakelwesen des spätern Altertums*, Leipzig 1889 (where the text of importance for our purposes is found on pp. 112–115).

114 The text of Kern, *Orph. Fragm.*, p. 262 is followed here, but cf. n. 34 on p. 263; the last edition of Eusebius's *Praeparatio*, however, reads ὕδρογενῆς, on which see the note by the publisher, K. Mras, *Eusebius Werke*, vol. VIII, *Die Praeparatio Evangelica*, pt. 2, Berlin 1956, p. 194 n. on line 5. The last reading (= born from the water) is a conjecture by Scaliger (H.G. Liddell – R. Scott – H. Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1940, p. 1844, s.v.; besides this guess no other texts are given in which the word is said to appear); ὕλογενῆς = born in the wood, cf. Liddell–Scott–Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 1848, s.v.

115 Cf. O. Stählin & L. Früchtel, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, vol. II, *Stromata Buch I–VI*, Berlin 1960, p. 410 l. 14, with the corresponding note in the critical apparatus.

116 In Buresch, *op. cit.*, p. 115 l. 10: ἐκ θεόθεν γνῶμην τε λαβὼν καὶ δίπλακα θεσμόν.

117 N. Walter, *Der Thoraausleger Aristobulos, Untersuchungen zu seinen Fragmenten und zu pseudepigraphischen Resten der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur*, Berlin 1964.

church father knew and used the idea himself. Is this a sign that the insertion comes from the time after Clement, as Walter thinks?¹¹⁸ It would seem so. But in any case the line with the divine predicate was contained in a version which was certainly current in the middle of the 2nd century.

Walter assumes that this verse comes from a stoicizing interpolator, who inserted an old-Orphic saying here, a practice we are familiar with in Plato.¹¹⁹ At what time that occurred, he does not make clear. In any case it does not seem probable to me that this interpolator is then dependent on Plato, since here again the point of the quotation in Plato, namely the relationship with *Dikē*, is absent. For this same reason—if we are not to assume with Walter the activity of an interpolator—it is not possible to have Plato borrow from this poem.¹²⁰ With the current state of affairs we must, in my view, conclude that Plato and this Orphic poem made use of the same formula, which was current in Orphic circles.¹²¹

The interpretation given to the formula in this poem stands out from the context. In the preceding text a description is given of how God, the invisible one, is seated in heaven, the earth under his feet, how his right hand rests on the borders of the Ocean and the mountains quake before Him; “He is perfect and accomplishes everything on earth, because He himself possesses the beginning, middle and end.” Here, then, God is described as the ruler of the universe; He is enthroned in heaven, but makes everything work on earth. One might say: He is cosmocrator and pantocrator.

It was in this spirit that Aristobulus took it when he quoted this Orphic poem. Moses taught, he maintains, about the creation: God spoke and it came into being. The Greek philosophers followed Moses; Orpheus gives a discussion *περὶ τοῦ διακρατεῖσθαι θείᾳ δυνάμει τὰ πάντα καὶ γενητὰ ὑπάρχειν καὶ ἐπὶ*

118 Walter, *op. cit.*, pp. 230–231, 238. Cf. also the Tübingen Theosophy 10, ap. Buresch, *Klaros*, p. 96, where we read that Aristobulos acknowledged in a letter to Ptolemy that Greek theosophy is borrowed from the Hebrew, since it is as clear as day *ὅτι κατηχολούθησεν ὁ Πλάτων τῇ καθ’ ἡμᾶς νομοθεσίᾳ*.

119 Walter, *op. cit.*, pp. 230–231.

120 Reference has also been made, e.g. by Lobeck (*Aglaophamus*, I, p. 450) and Casel (*op. cit.*, pp. 29, 36), to the link between line 1: . . . θύρας δ’ ἐπίθεσθε βέβηλοι/πάντες ὁμῶς (for variants see Kern, *Orph. Fragm.*, p. 257 on vv. 1–2) and Plato, *Symposion* 218b (adopted by Kern, *loc. cit.*, as fr. 13): οἱ δὲ οἰκέται, καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλος βέβηλός τε καὶ ἄγροικος, πύλας πάνυ μεγάλας τοῖς ὥσιν ἐπίθεσθε. Here too Plato may well have applied a formula common among the Orphics, which is also used in the poem, but this is not to say that the poem was already in existence *before* Plato’s day.

121 Walter, *loc. cit.*, also makes a connection with fr. 21 and 168. He appears not to be aware of Zeller’s article.

πάντων εἶναι τὸν θεόν (ap. Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* XIII 12.4). Clement of Alexandria frames the quotations from this part of the poem with the observation that this sounds like a paraphrase of such texts as Isa 66:1, 60:1–2 and 40:12: “Who has measured the waters in the hollow of his hand and marked off the heavens with a span?” (Clem. *Strom.* V 14.124.1–2; he might also have quoted other OT texts, such as Ps 103:19; Isa 44:24; 55:11). Here, then, the divine predicate is clearly taken in a cosmological sense, not as an “eternity formula” but as a description of God’s almighty power.

In this connection it is interesting that in the Tübingen Theosophy a dual explanation of this verse is given, immediately following the quotation of the poem. There we read first: ὅτι θεὸς ἀρχὴν μὲν ἔχει τὸν οὐρανόν, μέσον δὲ τὴν γῆν, τέλος δὲ τὰ ὑποχθονία. The interpretation is thus applied here to the “three-tier” universe over which God rules: τὸ ἔχων εἰληπται ἀντὶ τοῦ κρατῶν καὶ ἄρχων. But then another possibility is also offered: ἢ ὅτι ἀρχὴν μὲν ἔχει λέγεται ὡς γενεσιουργὸς τῶν ἄλλων, μέσον δὲ ὡς τὰ μεταξὺ γενονότα δημιουργήματα συνέχων, τέλος δὲ ὡς μετὰ τὴν πάντων παρέλευσιν αἰδίως διαμένων.¹²² So here it is taken in a chronological sense: God is referred to as creator, as maintainer and not perfecter but eternal. He rules over history and remains even after this has come to an end.

A notable feature of these explanations is the fact that they are made not on the basis of the text as it is found in the Orphic poem but of a form of the formula we also encountered in Josephus with τέλος instead of τελευτήν (see above, p. 184). But a light is thrown here—partly *expressis verbis*—on the fact that God rules over everything, He creates and remains after the course of history, not that He “is the beginning, middle and end”, as the text reads in Josephus.

It is still unclear from what circles and from what time these explanations derive. The character is typically that of a grammatical explication, as is also found elsewhere in teaching in the ancient world and also in various kinds of annotation of Holy Scripture. It is indeed striking that the need is evidently felt for more detailed explanation precisely with regard to this verse. This is understandable, because the concern was to defend against the misunderstanding that a beginning and end are being ascribed to the existence of God, just as particular events “have” a beginning and an end point (cf. below).

Later on in the Tübingen Theosophy there is again discussion of this same formula, namely in §64 (ed. K. Buresch, *op. cit.*, p. 117). It is difficult to discern a

122 Text in K. Buresch, *Klaros*, p. 115; whether the Theosophia can be ascribed to the Manichaeon Aristocritus, as Kern does (*Orph. Fragm.*, p. 263), is uncertain; see W. von Christ, W. Schmid & O. Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, Munich 1920, II/1, p. 612 n. 1 and II/2, p. 976.

particular principle of order in this excerpt from the Theosophy. It is preceded by a passage on the Orphic appellation Phanes (§61),¹²³ the oracle which called Socrates the wisest because he admitted that he knew nothing (§62); and a text, also quoted elsewhere, from Plato, *Epist.* 2 on keeping the mysteries of God secret by speaking in riddles (§63). The text of §64 is then followed by a statement by the Neo-Platonist Porphyry relating to human ignorance of the “first cause” (§65). So one might think that the collector was here assembling texts that related to human inability to know God other than by secret revelation. In the middle of this in §64 we then find this explanation: ὅτι ἡ τριάς ἀρχὴν καὶ μέσον καὶ τέλος ἔχει καὶ δῆλον ὅτι πάντα τὰ ὄντα διὰ τριάδος συνέστηκε. διὸ ἐπὶ τοῦ δύο ἀριθμοῦ ἄμφω μὲν λέγομεν καὶ ἀμφοτέροι· πάντες δὲ οὐ λέγομεν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τῶν τριῶν κυρίως καὶ τῶν ἐφεξῆς ἐξ αὐτῶν ταπτομένων τὴν προσηγορίαν ταύτην φέρομεν.

At first sight this text looks like a purely linguistic observation, namely as an answer to the question how many it takes to be able to speak of “all”. But from the introductory comment it is clear that there is more to it than this, namely that the Universe is built upon the number Three. And Weinreich rightly connected this text with Pythagorean views, pointing to the following texts:¹²⁴

Aristotle *De caelo* I, p. 268a τὰ τρία πάντα καὶ τὸ τρις πάντη, καθάπερ γὰρ φασὶ καὶ οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι, τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὰ πάντα τοῖς τρισὶν ὥρισται. τελευτὴ γὰρ καὶ μέσον καὶ ἀρχὴ τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἔχει τὸν τοῦ πάντος, ταῦτα δὲ τὸν τῆς τριάδος.¹²⁵

Ocellus, ap. John Lydus, *De Mens.* II 8 ἡ τριάς πρώτη συνέστησεν ἀρχὴν, μεσότητα καὶ τελευτήν.¹²⁶

Theon of Smyrna, *Expos. Rer. Plat.*, ed. Hiller, p. 100 (from the early 2nd century):¹²⁷ τριάς, ἥτις πρώτη ἀρχὴν καὶ μέσα καὶ τελευτήν ἔχει. διὸ καὶ πρώτη λέγεται πάντα εἶναι, since with lower numbers one speaks of “one” and “both”, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν τριῶν πάντα; as examples he then notes that people pour out three libations, to make clear ὅτι πάντα ἀγαθὰ αἰτούμεθα, and people speak of “thrice wretched” or “thrice happy”.

123 Adopted in Kern, *Orph. Fragm.*, as fr. 61.

124 O. Weinreich, “Aion in Eleusis,” p. 192 n. 2.

125 The text is also adopted in H. Diels & W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, Berlin 1951, vol. I, p. 455.

126 In Diels & Kranz, *op. cit.*, I, p. 441. This author was a Pythagorean of the 2nd century BCE; cf. R. Harder, *Ocellus Lucanus*, Berlin 1926 and H. Dörrie, “Okellos,” in: K. Ziegler & W. Sontheimer, *Der Kleine Pauly, Lexikon der Antike*, Munich 1972, vol. IV, col. 270.

127 W.D. Ross, “Theon (n),” in N.G.L. Hammond & H.H. Scullard, *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford 1970, p. 1058.

Martianus Capella VII (5th century):¹²⁸ “Trias vero princeps imparium numerus perfectusque censendus, nam prior initium medium finemque sortitur et centrum medietatis ad initium finemque interstitiorum aequaliter componit.”

Aristoxenos, ap. Stobaeus, *Ecl.* I 6.16 says of the odd number ἀρχὴν καὶ τελευτὴν καὶ μέσον ἔχει, because they comprise “beginning, climax and demise”.¹²⁹

Here, then, it is explicitly stated that this triad stands for the Universe. But this was more than just a linguistic numbers game. In the commentary by Servius on Virgil, *Buc.* VIII 75, “Numero Deus impare gaudet”, an anonymous gloss is taken up, which reads:¹³⁰ “iuxta Pythagoraeos, qui ternarium numerum perfectum summo deo adsignant, a quo initium et medium et finis est.” Various other possible explanations are also given. Here again, one cannot say where this gloss comes from. But to judge by its content it does indeed rely on correct information. The Pythagoreans explicated the number “Three” in this way, linking it with the Highest God. He is the source of all things.

The quotation from the Pythagorean Ps.-Archytas¹³¹ ap. Iamblichus, *Protrepticus* 4, points to the same thing. Here it is taught that the wisest person of all is one who is able to analyse all phenomena (πάντα τὰ γένεα) and reduce them to one and the same beginning and then arrive at a synthesis. In it he finds a vantage-point from which he is able to perceive God and everything placed in His ordering, and by intellectual activity to take the right path τὰς ἀρχὰς τοῖς πέρασι συνάψαντα¹³² καὶ ἐπιγνόντα διότι ὁ θεὸς ἀρχὰ τε καὶ τέλος καὶ μέσον

128 F.J.E. Raby, “Martianus Capella,” in: *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, p. 653.

129 On Aristoxenos, 2nd half of the 4th century BCE, see J.F. Mountford, *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, pp. 118–119.

130 G. Thilo & H. Hagen, *Servii Grammatici in Vergilii carmina commentarii*, Hildesheim 1961 (reprint of the 1881–1887 edition), vol. III, p. 105 (it is evident from the printing that it is an anonymous gloss; on this see vol. I, praefatio, p. iii).

131 Not included in Diels & Kranz, *Vorsokratiker*, who in vol. I, p. 439 list the reference by Iamblichus among the “inauthentic writings”. W.D. Ross, “Archytas,” in *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, p. 102, says: “Frs. of his mathematical works remain, but the other frs. cited as from him are late fabrications.” On this problem cf. W. Burkert, “Zur geistesgeschichtlichen Einordnung einiger Pseudopythagorica,” and H. Thesleff, “On the Problem of the Doric Pseudo-Pythagorica, an Alternative Theory of Date and Purpose,” in: *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique*, vol. XVIII, *Pseudepigrapha* I, Vandoeuvres–Genève 1972, pp. 23–102 (with discussion). But even though it is evidently a case of an “inauthentic” quotation, the text in any case witnesses to the high esteem in which Iamblichus held it and also shows that the view that is of importance for our subject was accepted at a particular time before Iamblichus.

132 Cf. Alcmaeon, fr. 2, ap. (Aristotle), *Probl.* 17.3, 916a, in: Diels & Kranz, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 215: τοὺς ἀνθρώπους φησὶν Ἄ. διὰ τοῦτο ἀπόλλυσθαι, ὅτι οὐ δύνανται τὴν ἀρχὴν τῷ τέλει προσάψαι. Cf. Heraclitus, fr. 103, in: Diels & Kranz, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 174: ξυνὸν γὰρ ἀρχὴ καὶ πέρας ἐπὶ

ἐντὶ πάντων τῶν κατὰ δίκαν τε καὶ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον περαινομένων. So the human mind, in the opinion of this Neo-Pythagorean, sees God in this trio, which orders everything in its plurality. In this sense it can be said that God is the “beginning, end and middle of all things”. Iamblichus provides an extensive clarification of this statement. In it he explains that as God leads to the full truth, complete happiness, the essence, the cause and the principia, human beings must try their hardest to gain knowledge of Him, so that they will perceive God clearly, find the broad path to Him and τὰ τέλη ταῖς ἀρχαῖς συνάψει. That life and happiness is the most perfect, because it does not keep the last things separate from the first things (and so does not get stuck in difference), but εἰς ἓν τὰ συναμφοτέρα ταῦτα συλλαβοῦσα ἀρχάς τε καὶ τέλος καὶ μέσον ὁμοῦ συνέχουσα. “Of this kind is, after all, the divine Cause, to which they who want to be happy must hold fast.” In his wording at this point Iamblichus follows his “text” as closely as possible, but he explicates it by introducing the concept of “the highest happiness” as a transition and connection between the intellectual work of analysis-synthesis and the contemplation of God. This is unbroken, comprises the sum of things, i.e. “beginning, end and middle”^{132a} and thus corresponds to the divine Cause.

If one compares “text” and “exposition” with each other, it seems to me that a certain shift cannot be denied. Ps.-Archytas after all names God himself with this predicate, while in Iamblichus it is ascribed to the perfect life and happiness. For the Neo-Platonist there is a certain distance between God and the Universe; it is not surprising, then, that following Archytas he speaks of “perceiving God clearly” but later in his exegesis speaks of “the divine Cause”.

In this connection it would perhaps be good to mention also a text by Apuleius, *De Platone et eius dogmate*, II *Philosophia moralis*, as this writer belongs to Middle Platonism and clearly still shows the distance between God and that “which has beginning, middle and end”. He writes there, in a disquisition that the wise person following God must do good not only in thought but also in action, the following: “Quippe quum summus Deorum cuncta haec non solum cogitationum ratione consideret, sed *prima, media et ultima*”¹³³ obeat,

κύκλου περιφερείας. But what is meant here in Ps.-Archytas is the movement of the *monas* to the many and back again.

^{132a} Cf. also the (Neo-)Platonic tradition in Iamblichus, *Theol. Arithm.*, p. 3 of Falco, on the Monad: ἀρχὴν τε καὶ μέσον καὶ τέλος ἀνειληφύια τῶν ὄλων . . . καθάπερ καὶ μονὰς ἀρχή τε καὶ μέσον καὶ τέλος ποσοῦ τε καὶ πηλίκου καὶ προσέτι πάσης ποιότητος, which is why it is like God.

¹³³ See also C.A. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, vol. I, p. 531: “saepius proverbii instar vulgo celebrati”, giving as examples: Dionysius Hal., *De compos. verb.* 18, p. 122: ὦν ἐστὶ πρῶτος τε καὶ μέσος

compertaque intima, providae ordinationis universitate et constantia regat.” Here the formula thus clearly serves as a reference to the Universe, which stands over against the Highest God and which He directs with His providence.

In the work of the younger contemporary of Apuleius, the church father *Irenaeus*, we find a clear example of the fact that in that time the combination “beginning, middle and end” also occurs outside a direct connection with God, as the totality of the world and history. This “profane” use, one might almost say, in *Irenaeus* is striking, since, as we have seen above, he is familiar with Plato’s saying, which he quotes just afterwards, but gives no particular indication that this is at the background here (although we were able to observe that he keeps to the “logical order” rather than that of the quotation).¹³⁴

The text is found in *Adv. Haereses* III 24.1, where *Irenaeus* states clearly, in opposition to the views of the heretics: “praedicationem vero ecclesiae undique et constantem et aequaliter perseverantem, et testimonium habentem a prophetis et ab apostolis et ab omnibus discipulis, quemadmodum ostendimus, per *initia et medietates et finem* et per universam Dei dispositionem et eam quae est in fide nostra . . .” Harvey breaks up the expression into factors and subsequently relates these to “the Prophets, Apostles and Church Catholic”, but earlier Grabe, followed by Stieren, had explained: *initia* = creation; *medietates* = time of the prophets; *finem* = time of Christ and the apostles.¹³⁵ The latter explanation seems to me a better option, since in *Irenaeus* “the end of times” comprises the time since Christ’s appearance.¹³⁶ But perhaps in the light of other texts, such as that of Apuleius mentioned above, it is better still

καὶ τελευταῖος . . . Ἠγησίας—Lucianus, *Rhet. Praec.* 15: ῥήτορά σε ὑπὲρ τοὺς πάντας ἀποφανῶ, οἷός αὐτός εἰμι, ἀναμφιλέκτως τὰ πρῶτα καὶ μέσα καὶ τελευταῖα τῶν λέγειν ἐπιχειρούντων ἔχων.—Lobeck also lists “Hippocrates adulterinus *De dec. Hab.* IV 354D: αὕτη γὰρ ἀρχὴ ἐν ἱατρικῇ καὶ μέσα καὶ τέλος. See also *Dissoi Logoi*, 6.13, in: Diels & Kranz, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 414 οὕτω λέλεκται μοι ὁ λόγος, καὶ ἔχεις ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος καὶ μέσον, thus = the totality.

134 W.W. Harvey (*Sancti Irenaei—libros quinque adversus Haereses*, Cambridge 1857, vol. II, p. 131 n. 3) and F. Sagnard (*Irénée de Lyon, Contre les Hérésies . . . livre III*, Paris 1952, p. 399) do indeed refer to the later text, *Adv. Haer.* III 25.5 with the quotation. It might be noted, incidentally, that the texts are not the same: (a) 24.1 “*initia et medietates et finem*”; (b) 25.5 “*initium et finem et mediationes*”. But in the nature of the Latin translation one should not perhaps ascribe too much significance to this difference.

135 W.W. Harvey, *op. cit.*, II, p. 131; A. Stieren, *Sancti Irenaei . . . contra omnes haereses libri quinque*, Leipzig 1853, vol. I, p. 552 n. 5, where he also cites J.E. Grabe with approval (he quotes Grabe’s words verbatim in vol. II, p. 925).

136 See my article, “Der Ausdruck ‘in den letzten Zeiten’ bei Irenaeus,” in: *Neotestamentica et Patristica, eine Freundesgabe Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag überreicht*, Leiden 1962, pp. 293–304.

not to dissolve the word connection into periods of time but to read it as a unity, an expression of the totality.

The formula is used in a clearly temporal sense in *Adv. Haereses* V 30.1, where Irenaeus speaks of the number of the Antichrist, 666, in which the number 6 occurs in the hundreds, tens, and units. To this he then links the observation: “*numerus enim qui dicitur [digitus] sex similiter custoditus recapitulationem ostendit universae apostasiae eius quae initio et quae in mediis temporibus et quae in fine erit.*” Here the formula thus relates to world history in its totality and in its distinct phases. The addition “*temporibus*” was evidently needed to bring this chronological sense clearly to expression.

If we now draw a provisional conclusion from material investigated in this section, we find that there must certainly have been an Orphic formula in which it was expressed that God “has the beginning, end and middle of all things in his hands”; that this formula is connected in Pythagorean numerology with the perfect number “three” and that this produces a description of the Universe. This formula had achieved a certain dissemination via Pythagorean and Platonic circles. It is striking, however, that it is not found in the available data from the Stoa.

Of all the texts that we have been able to assemble, the form in which the formula occurs in Ps.-Archytas agrees best with that of Josephus, *c. Apion*. II 190, because in both cases it is said that “God *is*”, not that “God *has*”.

There is a difference only in the sequence of the last two elements; in this regard the form in Ps.-Archytas agrees better with that in Plato, while that in Josephus is more “logical”. We may, in my view, conclude that the formula as rendered by Ps.-Archytas represents an intermediate stage. This view fits well with the also dominant opinion concerning the still obscure provenience of the Pseudo-Pythagorean writings.¹³⁷ At any rate his text confirms our earlier suggestion that in that famous passage Josephus picks up a reference to God current in certain philosophical circles and certainly among the Neo-Pythagoreans¹³⁸ and says: “The God of whom that is said is our God”, namely the “Cause of all that the Universe comprises”.

137 On this see the studies of Burkert and Thesloff mentioned in n. 131 on p. 198.

138 Cf. the observations of E. Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, part III.2, 2nd half, p. 113: “jene Verbindung platonischer und pythagoreischer Philosopheme, in welcher der Neupythagoreismus besteht”; and pp. 125–126: “Ihrer ganzen Denkweise nach sind allerdings auch die Platoniker der römischen Kaiserzeit den Neupythagoreern fast durchaus verwandt.”

One further text must be discussed in this context, namely the well-known Aiōn inscription of Eleusis, to which Weinreich devoted his important study which we have already cited a number of times. This inscription, published by G. Dittenberger, *Selectae Inscriptiones Graecae*, no. 1125 is a votive gift for Aiōn in order to ensure a continuing existence for Rome and the Eleusinian mysteries. In all probability it dates from the time of Augustus.¹³⁹ The sentence we are interested in here reads as follows: Αἰὼν ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀεὶ φύσει θεῖαι μένων κόσμος τε εἷς κατὰ τὰ αὐτά, ὁποῖος ἔστι καὶ ἦν καὶ ἔσται, ἀρχὴν μεσότητα τέλος οὐκ ἔχων, μεταβολῆς ἀμέτοχος, θείας φύσεως ἐργατὴς αἰωνίου πάντα.

With reference to Weinreich's paper we can leave the detailed interpretation of this inscription to one side at this juncture. Just one point may be noted briefly in our study which emerged partly from a text from the Apocalypse of John, namely that alongside the divine predicate—here negatively worded—we also encounter the combination “is and was and will be”. On an earlier occasion I dealt with this formula elsewhere and pointed out that it also appears in a somewhat altered form in the last book of the Bible.¹⁴⁰ This is too remarkable a coincidence to leave unmentioned. (See also below with n. 204.)

Weinreich was right to note that “Die Prädikation... ist rein philosophischer Art”.¹⁴¹ There is nothing here that points to the gods of the mysteries. Cumont believed he could discern influence of Persian Zervan theology in the formula ἀρχὴν κτλ, though he admitted that an explanation from Greek philosophy is also possible;¹⁴² but Nock held to the latter, disputing the former.¹⁴³ After all, why should one look further afield for something that can be found close by? The material assembled by Weinreich is in my view sufficient. I do think, however, that this scholar has not paid close enough attention to two special features that distinguish this inscription from the ideas associated with this formula in other texts. In the first place the predicate is clearly found in a chronological context and cannot be simply summarized in the expression “the Universe”. Aiōn, “which has no beginning, middle and end”, is therefore

139 O. Weinreich, “Aion in Eleusis,” pp. 174–175; but such an expert as A.D. Nock, “A Vision of Mandulis Aion,” in: *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, ed. Z. Stewart, Oxford 1972, vol. I, p. 382, dates this inscription “Probably of 74–3 B.C.”, without giving his reasons.

140 W.C. van Unnik, “A Formula Describing Prophecy,” *New Testament Studies* 9 (1962–1963), pp. 86–94.

141 O. Weinreich, “Aion,” p. 175.

142 F. Cumont, *Die orientalischen Religionen im römischen Heidentum*, Leipzig–Berlin 31931, p. 285.

143 A.D. Nock, *op. cit.*, p. 382.

“not susceptible to change”. The predicate also further qualifies the preceding eternity formula, since if desired this could be read as speaking about a finite time, even though it would then comprise “past, present and future”. But because of the addition this is ruled out. In the second place the negative wording is bound to attract notice. In the texts we have discussed so far we have not encountered this.

In the Tübingen Theosophy (see above) the formula is also taken chronologically, but the negative aspect is absent there. “The end” must therefore be interpreted as “remaining after the passing of all things”. It is clear that there is no direct relationship between these two texts (cf. also the difference between τέλος and τελευτή). Now the formula is also used differently in this Aiōn inscription in the sense that it is not employed here with the addition “of all things”. The word “has” does not bear the force of “have power over” but of “have in itself”. The creator of this inscription rejected the notion that this god began at some point while formerly he did not exist and will one day cease, so that he will then no longer be there. This is of course a completely different interpretation from what we find elsewhere.

It seems reasonable to infer from this inscription that the formula “beginning, middle and end” was current as a fixed combination and indicated limitation in time and space. According to Theophrastus, *Physic. opinionones* fr. 5 (ap. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*, p. 480), Xenophanes gave this description of ἀπειρον: οὔτε ἀρχὴν ἔχον οὔτε μέσον οὔτε τέλος and applied it to the “non-being”; Diels, *op. cit.*, refers to (Aristotle) in a note, p. 977b: ἀπειρον τὸ μὴ ὄν εἶναι. τοῦτο γὰρ οὔτε μέσον οὔτ’ ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος οὔτ’ ἄλλο μέρος οὐδὲν ἔχειν (cf. below).

But by linking the denial with the current formula, the author of this text draws a line between himself and other views. Does this distinguish Aiōn only from the transitory and creaturely? Or is this a reaction to a (rejected) theology which taught that God has indeed a “beginning, middle and end”, in other words was this saying coined against all manner of ideas in Greek mythology?

Did the author already have a picture of Aiōn in mind which later became well known, namely eternity imagined as a snake biting its own tail, so that one could not indeed speak of a beginning, a middle and an end?

With our current state of knowledge it is not really possible to give an answer to these questions. But what is indeed sure is that Plato’s text did not influence the writer and that if he was faced with a statement that God “has beginning, middle and end”, he did not interpret it correctly. It was only by adding the negation that he gave this formula the meaning of a circumlocution for “eternity”.

V

Alongside the formula comprising the three terms, “beginning, middle and end” we also meet one with two elements, which in fact forms the starting point for our study. Since the one is often mixed with the other, and since, as we have seen, Plato’s text in *Leges* IV 715C–716A and its various associations is so important to so many, we looked first at the threefold saying with its various ramifications. But now we need to return to our starting point.

It will be good at this point to create some order in the material by making a distinction between three different sorts of statement, namely those in which it is said: (a) that the deity *has* beginning and end; (b) that the deity *is* beginning and end; (c) that the deity has *no* beginning and end.

a *God has the Beginning and End*

Skythinos (contemporary with Plato)¹⁴⁴ ap. Plutarch, *De Pyth. Orac.* 17 (in: Diels, *Vorsokratiker*, I, p. 189) says, in relation to the lyre, ἦν ἀρμόζεται . . . Ἀπόλλων παῖσαν, ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος /συλλαβών. Plutarch quotes this verse in connection with a votive gift at Delphi, consisting of a golden pen with which to play the instrument; hence the text continues: ἔχει δὲ λαμπρὸν πλῆκτρον ἡλίου φάος. So Apollo plays the lyre with all its strings and this stands as a symbol for the world, on which, in its entirety, the Sun God shines. “Beginning and end” is thus the world in its entirety.

In a *Hymn to Tyche* it is said: πάντων γὰρ ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος ἄγιον ἔχεις.¹⁴⁵ The goddess of Fate is being praised here because she exercises direction over the entirety of history.

In the *Kerygma Petri*, a Christian writing from the early 2nd century, we read: γινώσκετε οὖν, ὅτι εἰς θεός ἐστιν, ὃς ἀρχὴν πάντων ἐποίησεν καὶ τέλους ἐξουσίαν ἔχων; this is followed by an enumeration of divine predicates, such as we find in many different Christian writings of the 2nd century, in a manner reminiscent of enumerations by philosophers of Middle Platonism.¹⁴⁶ This text is a call to the heathen to recognize the one God whom Jews and Christians worship. In the way in which “beginning and end” are further determined here, it is clear that the talk is of God as Creator, who has not withdrawn from this world

144 W.D. Ross, “Scythinus,” in: *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, p. 968.

145 Quoted by O. Weinreich, “Aion,” p. 182 (from *Berliner Klassiker Texte* V. 2, p. 143.)

146 *Kerygma Petri*, fr. 2, in E. Klostermann, *Apocrypha*, I, *Reste des Petrus-evangeliums, der Petrusapokalypse und des Kerygma Petri*, Berlin 1933, p. 13 (preserved in Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* VI 5:39, 2–3). Cf. Altaner & Stuiber, *Patrologie*⁷, pp. 133–134. See also my article, “Die Gotteslehre bei Aristides und in gnostischen Schriften,” *Theologische Zeitschrift* 17 (1961), pp. 166–175, together with the material discussed above on p. 188.

but also possesses power over its end. God is thus the Lord of world history. The world He created is not running into nothing, into chaos or annihilation, but is led by Him to an end which He sets; He has power over it, and so it is not an automatic process, because what has a beginning must also have an end (see below). Here, then, we find the terms in a historical-chronological context in line with Jewish and Christian eschatological ideas. It is notable that the wording does not read simply: “He has beginning and end”, but is given with varying descriptions. This is evidently done for clarification; one might even say, in order to prevent misunderstanding. But this then means that at the time of the composition of the *Kerygma Petri* the formula was still current among the divine predicates, while that was no longer the case at a later date. Clement of Alexandria, who preserved this quotation, gives a Christian explanation of it in his subsequent discussion (*Strom.* VI 7.58.1), since he takes the words “who has made the beginning of everything” as a reference to “the firstborn Son”, an explanation he seeks to support with a number of Bible texts. But it is striking here that he limits himself to these words and does not say a word about the second part of the statement. What is interesting for our subject is the way in which Clement introduces this quotation: “That the most excellent Greeks have no exact knowledge of God but only by way of surmise, Peter says in the *Kerygma*.” Later (39.5) he says of it that Peter wanted to change the manner of divine worship but did not preach another God. In so doing, then, Clement makes clear in what environment this terminology belongs.

A number of important data are found in the so-called *Orphic Hymns*. These were probably composed in Asia Minor in the 2nd century CE; despite the name they have nothing to do with Orphism.¹⁴⁷ This date and this provenance have been determined of course on the basis of this collection itself, but it is certainly a curious coincidence that in geographical location they appear to be at home in the same neighbourhood as the Revelation of John. Alongside two other quotations, which will be discussed below (p. 208), reference may be made here to a statement in *Hymn* 34, 14–15, where it is said of Apollo: ἔχεις δέ τε πείρατα κόσμου / πάντος· σοὶ δ' ἀρχή τε τελευτή τ' ἐστὶ μέλουσα. From the whole context in which these lines occur it is evident that here Apollo is being invoked as the one who oversees and directs the entire Universe. The two verses form a parallelism and “beginning and end” here are an elaboration on the preceding expression “boundaries of the cosmos”.

In *Aelius Aristides* (mid-2nd century) we encounter the expression twice, with some degree of variation. In his “Discourse to Zeus” §30 (ed. Dindorf,

147 For this chronological and geographical location see K. Ziegler, “Orphische Dichtung,” in: K. Ziegler & W. Sontheimer, *Der Kleine Pauly*, vol. IV, col. 357.

vol. I, p. 11), following a description of the character of Zeus with the use of a number of epithets it is said: οὗτος ἀπάντων ἀρχάς καὶ πέρατα καὶ μέτρα καὶ κλήρους, ἴσον πανταχοῦ πάντων κρατῶν. The speaker goes on to say that Zeus alone can speak appropriately about himself and so one must ἀπὸ τούτου ἄρχεσθαι and τελευτῶν εἰς τοῦτον, and one calls upon Zeus as a guide and helper, ὥσπερ εἰκὸς τὸν ἀπάντων κρατοῦντα ἀρχηγέτην καὶ τέλειον μόνον ὄντα τῶν πάντων (§31).¹⁴⁸ Here, then, the almighty power of Zeus is clearly expressed. He causes things to come into being and brings them to completion.

Amann was right to note in his commentary: “Die Gefplogenheit, ein Werk mit einer Anrufung und einem Lobpreis der Gottheit, vor allem des Zeus, zu beginnen und zu enden, ist uralt.”¹⁴⁹ But what is striking here is the rhetorically sophisticated way in which Aristides, tying in with this predicate of the Lord of All, concludes and crowns his discourse; in this speech in honour of Zeus, He is indeed the end. It is clear that the speaker is giving a variation on a well-known expression, taking “beginning and end” in the plural, because he has in view the great variety of events with which Zeus is concerned. Heavy emphasis is given in this passage to the word “everything” that is always controlled by Zeus. A parallel to this is found, as Amann correctly indicates,¹⁵⁰ in the “Discourse on Serapis” by the same author (§21, Dindorf, I, p. 91). Aristides points out that this God encompasses everything (ἅπαντα περιειληφέναι) and directs our whole life. For this reason the Alexandrians call Him “Dia”: διὰ πάντων ἥκει καὶ τὸ πᾶν πεπλήρωκε.¹⁵¹ After all, the powers of the other gods are divided and people call on one god for one thing and another for something else, but He ὥσπερ κορυφαῖος πάντων ἀρχάς καὶ πέρατα ἔχει. Aristides then elaborates this idea further in order to show how Serapis controls everything and also remains a ruler for people after death (καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀναγκαίαν τοῦ βίου τελευτὴν ἔτι οὗτος ἄρχων ἀνθρώποις μένει, p. 93). Here too the expression thus serves as a description of the absolute power of the Almighty, which extends even beyond the boundaries of death.

148 J. Amann (*Die Zeusrede des Ailios Aristides*, Stuttgart 1931, p. 44) translates: “der selbst allein alles aufs beste vollendet”; cf. the explanation on p. 109 concerning Zeus as τέλειος.

149 J. Amann, *op. cit.*, p. 109, with notes. In this connection cf. our comments on Josephus’s conclusion of the speech in *Ant. Jud.* VIII 280 (above, pp. ?f.).

150 J. Amann, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

151 Cf. also the commentary by A. Höfler, *Der Saraphishymnus des Ailios Aristides*, Stuttgart–Berlin 1935, pp. 40–80. The etymologizing explanation of Dia=accusative of Zeus, through the preposition *dia* = “through”, is very widespread in Antiquity; cf. O. Weinreich, “ζῆν und διὰ in der Etymologie des Ζεύς,” in: *Menekrates Zeus und Salmeneus*, Stuttgart 1933, pp. 105–108 (also in his *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*, Darmstadt 1968, pp. 409–412).

In the well-known *Magical Papyrus IV* (ed. K. Preisendanz, *Papyri Graecae Magicae*, vol. I, Leipzig–Berlin 1928, p. 124) in a prayer to Helios, “who shines upon the whole inhabited world”, it is said: “You are the great Serpent, leader of all the gods”, ὁ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἔχων καὶ τὴν τελευτὴν τῆς ὅλης οἰκουμένης, ὁ ἐν τῷ ὠκεανῷ ὀχεύων (1639–1642).

The difficulty with this text is that it cannot be dated. As preserved for us here, it certainly comes from a typically syncretistic environment in which Hebrew divine names also appear as magical words. But its origins can of course be older. Can we discern here an echo of the above-cited “Orphic” Hymn? Typical here is the way in which Egypt is given its “place in the sun”. But the interpretation is clear: “beginning and end” are taken in a geographical sense here.

We may also mention a late witness, namely by Augustine, *De Civitate Dei* VII 30, in a passage of which such an expert as Festugière wrote: “un chapitre qu’aurait pu signer un théologien païen du II^e siècle”.¹⁵² Here Augustine declares: “illum Deum colimus, qui naturis a se creatis et subsistendi et movendi *initia finesque* constituit”. This, then, expresses the idea that God determined the boundaries within which the lives of all His creatures are played out, and that he therefore rules over them.

b *God is the Beginning and End*

For this idea, the following texts may be mentioned:

In the extensive description of the Most High God in the Gnostic *Apocryphon of John* (1st half of the 2nd century)¹⁵³ it is declared: “Eine ἀρχή über die niemand herrscht, *ist er*. Denn niemand (oder: nichts) existierte vor ihm, noch bedarf er ihrer (plur.). Er braucht auch kein Leben, denn er ist ewig. Er braucht nichts, denn er ist unvollendbar, da er gar nicht nötig hatte, dass er vollendet werde, sondern jederzeit ganz *Vollendung* ist.”¹⁵⁴ Since the Greek text of this passage is still lost and the researcher has to make do with a Coptic translation, it is not completely clear whether the divine predicate we seek is in fact found here. If so, it is striking that the two elements are separated from each

152 A.J. Festugière, *Révélation*, vol. IV, *Le Dieu inconnu*, p. 107.

153 On this see my article mentioned on p. 204 n. 146 above.

154 The text follows the Berlin manuscript, p. 23, in: W. Till & H.M. Schenke, *Die gnostischen Schriften des Koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502*, Berlin 2¹⁹⁷², p. 87 (the reading differs slightly in the other versions in M. Krause & P. Labib, *Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo*, Wiesbaden 1962).

other by the insertion concerning “life”. So if this is really an instance of ἀρχή καὶ τέλος, then the predicate is indeed understood in a “chronological” sense and τέλος is not interpreted as “end” but as “completion”. The Gnostic writer could thus indeed use the terms in this sense. This would indicate that this author knew the combination but took it in a particular way so as to protect it against misunderstanding. But all this is not completely certain, since Martin Krause, who has occupied himself intensively with this material, translates ἀρχή here as “Reich”.¹⁵⁵ Now it is possible that he did not notice the connection between this word and the following “Vollendung”; but I would not want to rule out the possibility that his view is correct and that this text must then be scrapped from this series. Personally, however, I prefer the first opinion I presented, if with a certain amount of hesitation. However, the fact that the combination occurs as a divine predicate and that it presented difficulties (see below, p. 217) which the writer of the *Apocryphon* or his *Vorlage* felt but dealt with by means of a particular interpretation, leads me to incline towards my view.

In the *Orphic Hymns* (see above, pp. 204–5) the predicate is applied to gods on two occasions. In 4.1–2 Ouranos is praised in song: Οὐρανὲ παγγενέτωρ, κόσμου μέρος αἰὲν ἀτειρές, / πρεσβυγένηθλ', ἀρχὴ πάντων πάντων τε τελευτή. For πρεσβυγένηθλος, this text is the only one given in Liddell–Scott; for the meaning reference is made to πρεσβυγενής “firstborn”, or in general, “old”.¹⁵⁶ The combination “beginning and end” gives the strong impression that it was taken as fixed with other epithets. Since Ouranos in the first line is called upon as “All-begetter”, the giving of this name may be viewed as an explanation of ἀρχὴ πάντων, but why he is “the end of all things” is not further clarified. So it seems to me to be better, partly in connection with vv. 3–5 (σφαιριθδὸν ἐλίσσόμενος περὶ γαῖαν, / . . . ῥόμβου δῖναισιν ὁδεύων, / οὐράνιος χθονίος τε φύλαξ πάντων περιβληθείς) not to take this predicate in a chronological sense either, but as a reference to the “all-embracing” character of heaven.

In a *Hymn to Zeus* 15.3–7 the predicate is surrounded by a host of epithets ascribed to the great Olympian. Here the text reads as follows: παντογένηθλ', ἀρχὴ πάντων πάντων τε τελευτή. The loose accumulation of adjectives that precede and follow it does not throw any light on this combination. In vv. 3–5 it is, however, stated that Zeus is king, through whose head “these divine things”

155 See W. Foerster, with E. Haenchen and M. Krause, *Die Gnosis*, Zürich–Stuttgart 1969, vol. I, p. 143.

156 Liddell–Scott–Jones, *Greek–English Lexicon*, p. 1462, s.v.

came into being, namely earth, mountains, sea καὶ πάνθ' ὅπως οὐρανὸς ἔντος ἔταξε.

We may therefore think here of the all-encompassing power of Zeus, who in vv. 10–11 is implored to grant health, peace and wealth. Here too by the addition of “All-begetter” an explanation is given of ἀρχή πάντων, but why there is talk of the end in relation to Zeus remains unclear, unless an existing term with a fixed meaning is being borrowed here. And then the whole vocabulary of the context points to the almighty cosmic power of Zeus.

For the sake of completeness a further parallel reference might be added which, as far as I have been able to determine, occurs only in the *Prooemium* of the *Orphic Hymns*, v. 42 (ed. G. Quandt, p. 2). This introductory song names a series of divine names and deified powers, who are called upon, culminating in these lines (vv. 40ff.): “the Mother of the immortal ones, Attis and Men, I call upon / the divine Ourania and also the immortal holy Adonis” / Ἀρχὴν τ' ἡδὲ Πέρας—τὸ γὰρ ἔπλετο πάσι μέγιστον—to make an appearance at that sacrifice. I think Quandt is right to capitalise the words ἀρχή and πέρας in his edition, since in this list they do indeed constitute a divine power. The big question now is that of the meaning of τό. Does this relate to πέρας alone or are ἀρχή and πέρας taken as a unit here? Another question is, Why do we read πέρας here rather than τέλος? Is this poetic licence or does this underline the fact that the boundary of the world is meant here? From the context one might deduce that Ἀρχή is being equated here with the Great Mother from whom all life comes and Πέρας with the dying young god Attis-Adonis, who comes back to life. This is an interpretation that might indicate that this combination was indeed a fixed epithet. The further explanation with τὸ γὰρ κατὰ then indicates that “beginning and end” is the most important thing of all for all people. The connection with the Mother/Goddess of Heaven and Attis/Adonis may possibly indicate a provenience from Asia Minor, though of course since this text comes from the time of Syncretism it is difficult to say with any certainty.

In the famous *Magical Papyrus* of Paris we find two prayers which may be of significance for our study.¹⁵⁷ In *PGM* IV 1125f. (Preisendanz, I, p. 110), the Pneuma is called upon, who proceeds (διήκον) from heaven to the earth, to the boundaries of the underworld, who goes into humans and goes out again in accordance with God's will; to this Spirit is said: χαίρε, ἀρχή καὶ τέλος τῆς

157 O. Weinreich (“Aion in Eleusis”, p. 182) also referred to a place in a Leiden *Magical Papyrus* (*PGM* XIII 130, Preisendanz, II, p. 92), where the words ἀρχή καὶ τέλος do indeed occur, but this text has nothing to do with a divine predicate. It gives a regulation concerning a mixing vessel containing milk from a black cow and wine, without seawater: ἔστιν γὰρ ἀρχή καὶ τέλος. Preisendanz correctly translates here: “Denn das ist Spende und Abgabe”.

ἀκινήτου φύσεως. This Pneuma¹⁵⁸ is thus clearly the working instrument of God in the universe, but not God himself. Shortly afterwards (r. 1145ff.) God will be praised; here the Spirit who enables the praise and worship is greeted and welcomed. The Spirit is “beginning and end of the immovable nature” (= God). The best way to render the combination is thus with “the totality”; it describes how in this Pneuma God’s nature gives itself completely.

The expression occurs much more directly as a predicate of the deity in a prayer to Selene, the moon goddess (IV 2826ff.; Preisendanz, I, p. 162). There this goddess is called upon thus: “Universal Mother; for you come and go on Olympus and visit the vast and immense Abyss”, ἀρχή/καὶ τέλος εἶ, πάντων δὲ σὺ μούνη/ἀνάσσεις. ἐκ σέο γὰρ πάντ’ ἐστὶ/καὶ εἰς <σ>, αἰών <ι>ε, πάντα τελευτᾷ.

This text is particularly interesting because of the more detailed specifications that are added to the predicate here. It is noticeable that dominion is mentioned in first place. This is justified with the statement that everything flows from this goddess and everything finds an end through her. This Selene is thus addressed here as “Eternal”, but this does not permit us to say that ἀρχή καὶ τέλος is an “eternity formula”.¹⁵⁹ On the contrary: it relates to all things that have, precisely, a beginning and end; eternity is expressed in the address αἰώνιε. This eternal goddess’s dominion over everything is supported by the words: “for from You” etc. This wording is reminiscent of statements in Paul, such as Rom 11:36, ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι’ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα and 1 Cor 8:6 ἐξ οὗ (i.e. God) τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν. Hence this prayer to Selene is frequently discussed in relation to these texts.¹⁶⁰ According to Lietzmann what we have here is a Stoic formula which was taken up in Hellenistic mysticism.¹⁶¹ One

158 Cf. H. Kleinknecht, πνεῦμα, in Kittel & Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. VIII, esp. pp. 336–337, 350–355.

159 O. Weinreich, “Aion in Eleusis”, p. 183.

160 Norden (*Agnostos Theos*, p. 249) writes: “in einem Hymnus an Selene (bei Abel, *Orphica* S. 294,36, auch in dem von Wessely edierten Pariser Zauberpapyrus V. 2838)”, giving the impression that two different texts are being spoken of here (also Lietzmann, *Römer*, p. 107 and O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*, Göttingen 121963, cite this text from Abel). But there is a misunderstanding afoot here, since this is one and the same text. E. Abel, *Orphica* (Leipzig–Prague 1885), p. 294 also included “Hymni Magici” in his collection following the edition by E. Miller (1868)—a publisher who in Abel’s words “altum silentium tenet” concerning the provenance of his texts (Abel, *op. cit.*, p. 289 n.). But Miller was the first to publish from the Paris Magical Papyrus, followed later by C. Wessely (1888), who provided an improved edition; see Preisendanz, *PGM*, I, p. 64. Reference to Abel’s outdated book should thus be discontinued.

161 H. Lietzmann, *Römer*, p. 107: “Die Formel entstammt dem stoischen Pantheismus... Sie ist dann vor der hellenistischen Mystik aufgenommen und so auch dem griechischen

cannot conclude from this explanation that the predicate “Beginning and End” also has a Stoic origin, since in the writings of the Stoa, as far as I have been able to determine, this formula does not occur.¹⁶² In the case of this prayer, though, it is striking that in this explication τελευτᾷ is given as an explanation of τέλος, and not, as one might expect, τελείται, or that, given this explanation, the formula ἀρχὴ καὶ τελευτή, which also occurs (see above, pp. 196–97), is not employed. Has a fusion occurred here between two originally different formulations, one might wonder? In principle this is not inconceivable. Be that as it may, this explanatory observation does indeed give a clear explanation. It is evident that the composer of this prayer was familiar with this combination “The Beginning and the End”, because he does not begin by saying “Everything comes from You” etc. and continue with the words “and so You are Beginning and End”; instead this formula stands right at the beginning. Why this is connected with Selene, the moon goddess, is not apparent. Norden and others have mentioned as a further parallel the statement by Marcus Aurelius, *In semetipsum* IV 23: ὦ φύσις, ἐκ σοῦ πάντα, ἐν σοὶ πάντα, εἰς σέ πάντα, where Nature is thus addressed.

In this spirit one might thus think that the Moon, which has such an important part to play in the religions of the Near East, is viewed as a symbol of the Mother Goddess (Mother Nature).¹⁶³ But if we read this prayer in its entirety (r. 2785–2870) we see how a large number of names for the goddess from a variety of backgrounds are piled up here with the clear aim of making the “power” of this prayer as strong as possible.

Precisely because this prayer puts into words ideas associated with this divine predicate—much more clearly than any other text that we have looked at so far—it is of eminent significance. All the more regrettable, then, that the date of composition of this prayer is completely unknown. It is found in this magical papyrus, which according to the first publisher C. Wessely and others was written at the beginning of the 4th century CE.¹⁶⁴ This dating is thus the *terminus ad quem*; but there is not the slightest indication of how much

Judentum bekannt geworden, das sie dem Pls [Paulus] vermittelt hat”; here he follows E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, pp. 240–250: “Eine stoische Doxologie bei Paulus. Geschichte einer Allmachtsformel”.

162 In Marcus Aurelius, *In semetipsum* V 32.2, in answer to the question τίς οὖν ψυχὴ ἔντεχνος καὶ ἐπιστήμων; it is said: ἡ εἰδυῖα ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος καὶ τὸν δι’ ὅλης τῆς οὐσίας διήκοντα λόγον κτλ. Here, then, the words “beginning and end” are not a divine predicate but a reference to the totality of reality.

163 See M. Eliade, “Mond,” in: *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*³, vol. IV, cols. 1094–1097.

164 For this dating see K. Preisendanz, *P.G.M.*, I, p. 64.

earlier than this the original version was prepared. That elsewhere in this papyrus (r. 2449) Emperor Hadrian is named does not in itself tell us anything in respect of this collection of spells and prayers; it is a story about the miraculous power demonstrated to this emperor by an Egyptian and merely shows that this specific text came into being sometime after the life of Hadrian. But for other texts such as this prayer to Selene, this datum tells us nothing.

This *extra*-Christian text may not of course be regarded—consciously or unconsciously—as *pre*-Christian. In view of the fact that this prayer as a whole has such a compilatory character I think it may be from the 3rd century, but this does not mean that this single prayer with the predicate “Beginning and End” also has to be dated so late.

In fact we have to distinguish three phases here, perhaps even four: (a) the first formulation of this address; (b) its adoption into the prayer as a whole; (c) the adoption of both of these in the collection of magical spells; (d) this written document as preserved in Paris (though it is uncertain whether [c] and [d] coincide). The only thing, then, that can be affirmed as things stand is that this divine predicate was thus also current outside the Jewish and Christian realm. In my view, however, it is going too far on the basis of the above-mentioned texts from the Magical Papyrus, the “Orphic Hymns” and the Revelation of John (see above, pp. 205, 208–9), to state with Dr. Koops: “*Cogitatio frequentissime in religione temporis Hellenistici, quamquam forma varia est, invenitur*”,¹⁶⁵ since it would be good to remember how many centuries and what an extensive area are embraced in this “*religio temporis Hellenistici*”!

Of great significance for our subject is *Philo*, whose voice has still been barely heard in this matter.¹⁶⁶

In his *De Plantatione* 93 Philo writes: ἃ τοίνυν ὑπεσχόμεθα, ἤδη σχεδὸν ἀποδέδεικται, τὸ φυτὸν μὲν τὸ ἀρχὴν τε καὶ τέλος λαμβάνεσθαι τῶν ἀπάντων εἶναι θεόν, χωρίον δὲ τὸ ἀκόλουθον τὸ ἐν μηδενὶ τῶν ἐν γενέσει τέλειον εὐρίσκεσθαι, ἐπ’ αὐτῷ δ’ ἔσθ’ ὅτε χάρισι τοῦ αἰτίου προφαίνεσθαι, καρπὸς δὲ τὸ τὰς τοῦ θεοῦ διαιωνίζειν χάριτας καὶ ὁμβρούσας ἀπαύστως μηδέποτε λήγειν. It was necessary to print this whole passage because here Philo is summing up a preceding argument which began already in §73 and provides a typical exposition of Gen 21:33, where the Greek translation reads: “And Abraham planted a plot of land by the Well of the oath and there named the name of the Lord, ‘Everlasting God.’”¹⁶⁷

165 M.A. Koops, *Observationes in Hymnos Orphicos*, Leiden 1932, p. 14 (italics mine).

166 An exception is G. Dellling, ἀρχή, in: Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. I, p. 478.

167 This constitutes a different reading from that in the current Hebrew text, which, in translation, says: “And (Abraham) planted a tamarisk in Beer-sheba, and called there on the name of the Lord, the everlasting God.”

In this passage of Scripture he sees three elements, namely the cultivated earth, the place and the fruit, namely the change of the Divine Name. Philo promised to show the significance of this and in §93 he states, not without satisfaction, that he has succeeded in doing this: the plant is the understanding of “beginning and end” as God—the place indicates that nothing in creation is perfect, but that now and then the perfect is manifest through the gracious gifts of the Cause (God)—the fruit consists in the eternally remaining divine grace.

Philo had to travel a long and, to us, remarkable road before he reached this goal. It is of course of primary importance for our subject to note his demonstration of the first point, but besides this it is essential not to lose from view the framework in which this stands. In what way does Philo then manage, starting with the information about this piece of land in the text, to arrive at the view that God must be taken as “beginning and end”? His train of thought is curious and characteristic of him. For he puts his finger on ἄρουρα in the text, which in Egypt is a parcel of land of one hundred cubits square¹⁶⁸ and this brings him to “the greatest and most perfect term”, namely ten thousand, ὥστε ἀρχὴν μὲν ἀριθμῶν εἶναι μονάδα, τέλος δὲ ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὴν πρώτην σύνθεσιν μυριάδα (§76). This word “ten thousand” is so significant because in Greek it is the highest numerical value that can be expressed in a single word; hence the possibility of calling it “end”. One does not have to look far to find the provenance of this idea, namely in Pythagorean numerology. Philo subsequently appeals to “some”, without further indication of who these are. They were not wrong, according to him, to compare the *monas* with the starting line in the stadium and the *urias* (number ten thousand) with the finishing line in the individual race,¹⁶⁹ while the numbers in-between then correspond to the competitors: “because they begin with the number one as the start to hasten to the number ten thousand and find the end-point there” (ἀρχόμενοι γὰρ ὥσπερ ἀπὸ βαλβίδος φέρεσθαι μονάδος, παρὰ μυριάδα τὸ τέλος ἴστανται). And then in §77 comes this significant statement: “some then, starting from such views as symbols, have said that God is the beginning and limit of all things” (τὸν θεὸν ἀρχὴν καὶ πέρας εἶναι τῶν ἀπάντων) and Philo calls this a “doctrine suitable for calling the true religious life into being” (δόγμα κατασκευαστικὸν εὐσεβείας); “whenever this doctrine is planted in the soul, it produces the most beautiful and most fruitful plant, namely piety”. We clearly see here that Philo is borrowing this view of “God as Beginning and End” from others, gladly making it his own, because it leads to a truly pious life. The “exegesis” of the two other parts of the

168 For this meaning of ἄρουρα see Liddell–Scott–Jones, *Greek–English Lexicon*, p. 245, s.v. II; Philo also mentions it himself.

169 Liddell–Scott–Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 873, s.v. καμπτήρ—actually: turning point, namely for the return stretch.

text from Genesis, namely of the source of the Oath and the two names of God (§§78–92) can be left to one side, since—though interesting in its own right—it throws no light on our subject.

It cannot be denied that Philo conjures this divine predicate up in a way that is as surprising as it is subtle. Why this doctrine should lead to a divinely fruitful life, however, he does not explicitly discuss, but this can be inferred from what follows. Since people know God as “beginning and end”, they know where they are starting from and where they should end up. Hence Philo says in §94: “The sacred Word wills, that we who are not yet perfect (τοῖς μήπω τελειωθείσιν ἡμῖν), but are still moving in the in-between numbers of the so-called duties (ἔτι δὲ ἐν μέσοις ἀριθμοῖς τῶν λεγομένων καθηκόντων ἐξεταζόμενοις), devote ourselves to agriculture”, i.e. to the work that lies in our power. The end, the goal and perfection go together in this τέλος and give direction to life. “Beginning and end” here, then, means the totality,¹⁷⁰ but here they are also related to the life of human beings (see also the image of the race track).

In *Quis rerum divinarum heres* 187 Philo discusses this Pythagorean Monad as the image of the only God, who is perfect (εἰκὼν οὖσα τοῦ μόνου πλήρους θεοῦ), since the *monas* by nature does not admit of any increase or reduction in itself. According to §189 the word of the poet applies to it: ἐν σοὶ μὲν λήξω, σέο δ’ ἄρξομαι (*Iliad* IX 97), because if the numbers are broken up one comes to the “unit” and then the numerology starts again. Here too he refers clearly to the Pythagoreans, for whom the *monas* is not a number but a principle. Here, however, there is no mention of τέλος and this gives the discussion a rather different character. One might think of a cycle,¹⁷¹ but this is not Philo’s intention. So much is apparent from what he discussed earlier in *Quis rerum div. heres* 120–122. There the idea is more that God has the beginning and end of human life in his hands. Prooftexts from Scripture are Exod 13:1f. (the firstborn belongs to God) and Num 31:29 (τὸ τέλος—here, the tribute!—is for the Lord) “as the starting points are of the Lord, so too the end points” (ὥσπερ αἱ ἀρχαὶ θεοῦ οὕτως καὶ τὰ τέλη θεοῦ). Nature also demonstrates this, since “the beginning of a plant is the seed and the fruit is the end; neither is the business of the farmer but that of nature. Nature is the beginning of knowledge, . . . but also the end (πέρας) does not lie in human hands.” We therefore move in the middle

170 Cf. also Philo, *De Spec. Leg.* III 29: “for perhaps seduced by false rather than genuine habits they run the risk of forgetting veneration of the One God”, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος τῆς ἀνωτάτω βαρυστοιχίας.

171 Cf. the comprehensive note on this by M. Harl in: *Les œuvres de Philon d’Alexandrie*, vol. XV, *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit*, Paris 1966, p. 331; and Heraclitus, for which cf. p. 198 n. 132 above.

between “end/goal and beginning” with all our activities, as if the creature also brings something about (§121). Philo borrows an even clearer proof from the Creation account, namely Gen 1:1 ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησε and Gen 2:1ff. συνετέλεσεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν (§122).

The remarkable thing here is the double proof from Scripture, supported by the example of nature. Philo knows the terminology but employs it in plural form, probably in order to indicate the plurality in the human world. What is interesting here is how on the one hand beginning and end are seen in God’s power, while on the other the piece between the two extremes is left to the devices of the human being, as also was evident in the passage from *De Plantatione*.

If one takes these texts by the Alexandrian Jewish philosopher together, one can clearly see where, for him, this way of speaking of God comes from and that for him this divine predicate is not used so much in a cosmological sense as the Ruler of All, but is directly related to human life, God forming its beginning and end and determining its direction.

In this connection a notable statement by the Christian bishop Ignatius, in his *Eph.* 14:1 should be mentioned. After speaking in the preceding chapter of nothing being better than peace, through which all conflict on earth is ended, he says to his readers: “And none of this will escape you, if you keep faith and love perfectly focused on Jesus Christ”, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀρχὴ ζωῆς καὶ τέλος. ἀρχὴ μὲν πίστις, τέλος δὲ ἀγάπη. τὰ δὲ δυὸ ἐν ἐνότητι γεγόμενα θεὸς ἐστίν. The beginning of this passage is not unfamiliar, as parallels to this set of ideas are found frequently in Christian literature.¹⁷²

Since what is spoken of here is the mutual relationship between faith and love in the life of Christians, this text would not necessarily have to be considered in this study. But the last part attracts attention. Bauer is correct to speak of “eine kühne Wendung”.¹⁷³ Ignatius of course wants to say something like: “When faith is united with love, God is present.”¹⁷⁴ But how does he arrive at this expression? It would surely have been simpler to say that this is how one reaches God. Funk gave a simple explanation of the words θεὸς ἐστίν with “Deum possidet, qui fidem et caritatem habet.”¹⁷⁵ In order to understand this

172 These are indicated in the commentary by W. Bauer, *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbrief*, Tübingen 1920, p. 213.

173 W. Bauer, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

174 R.M. Grant, *The Apostolic Fathers*, vol. IV, *Ignatius of Antioch*, Camden N.Y. 1966, p. 45.

175 F.X. Funk, *Patres Apostolici*, Tübingen 1901, vol. I, p. 225. So also W. Bauer, *op. cit.*, p. 213: “dass wer Glauben und Liebe hat, Gott selbst besitzt.”

expression must one assume that Ignatius was familiar with the divine predicate “the Beginning and End” and that this is operating in the background? The train of thought would then be: you know after all that God is “the Beginning and End of all things”; so if these two, faith and love, come together as a unity, as beginning and end, then God is there. Or is the background to this stenographic expression different? If Ignatius is reasoning: faith is oriented to Christ, “our God” (*Eph.*, praef.) and so too love; faith is the “beginning” of adherence to Christ and love is the goal, namely the revelation of faith (see 14:2); the words ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος together mean that the circle is closed (see above, pp. 198–99), the totality of life with Christ = God. This last explanation is in my view a more obvious one, because “beginning” and “end” are clearly related here to human activities.

In an appendix (pp. 230–35) I have assembled a number of texts from Clement of Alexandria and Origen. These church authors were familiar with the Revelation of John, as is apparent from these texts. Since their views were thus influenced in part by the words of the Bible, I think it was methodologically appropriate not to discuss them in this part of our study, because here we are asking whether and how the divine predicate in question occurred in the non-Christian world (things are different with the above-mentioned text of Ignatius).

c *God has no Beginning or End*

This is clearly expressed by *Thales*. This declaration by the Milesian has been handed down in two doxographies from the 2nd century CE, a fact of interest to us because it proves that this saying attracted attention and was still current in the period in which we are primarily interested in this context.

It is quoted as follows in Diogenes Laertius I 36 (see Diels & Kranz, *Vorsokratiker*, I, p. 71): τί τὸ θεῖον; τὸ μήτε ἀρχὴν ἔχον μήτε τελευτὴν. In Hippolytus, *Ref.* I 1.3 it reads θεὸν δὲ τοῦτ' εἶναι, τὸ μήτε ἀρχὴν μήτε τελευτὴν ἔχον. In addition the same philosopher makes the statement in *Ref.* I Prooem.1–2: ἀρχὴν τοῦ πάντος εἶναι καὶ τέλος τὸ ὕδωρ, ἐκ γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα συνίστασθαι πηγνυμένου καὶ πάλιν διανιεμένου ἐπιφέρεισθαι τε αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα. So there water is the beginning and the end.

Melissos, *Peri Physeōs* or *Peri tou Ontos* (from Simplicius, in Diels & Kranz, *Vosokratiker*, I, pp. 268–269): fr. 2 ὅτι τοῖνυν οὐκ ἐγένετο, ἔστι τε καὶ αἰεὶ ἦν καὶ αἰεὶ ἔσται καὶ ἀρχὴν οὐκ ἔχει οὔδε τελευτὴν, ἀλλ' ἄπειρόν ἐστιν. εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἐγένετο, ἀρχὴν ἂν εἶχεν (ἤρξατο γὰρ ἂν ποτε γενόμενον) καὶ τελευτὴν (ἐτελεύτησε γὰρ ἂν ποτε γενόμενον), “but when it did not begin and end, it always was and will always be and has no beginning or end”. fr. 4: ἀρχὴν τε καὶ τέλος ἔχον οὐδὲν οὔτε αἰδῖον οὔτε ἄπειρόν ἐστιν. Here, then, the formula is found in a philosophical survey of

“being eternal” and “becoming”; so this pair of terms, “beginning and end”, does not fit with the concepts “eternal” and “infinite”.

Metrodorus of Chios (ap. Ps.-Plutarch, *Strom.* 11, in Diels & Kranz, *Vorsokratiker*, II, p. 231) offers a comparable consideration: τὸ πᾶν ἰσὶ ἀϊδιον . . . ἄπειρον. οὐ γὰρ ἔχειν ἀρχὴν . . . οὐδὲ πέρας οὐδὲ τελευτὴν.

Aristotle, *De caelo* 2.1., p. 283b, relates this view to heaven: the latter “did not become and knows no annihilation, as some say of it, but is *one* and eternal”, ἀρχὴν μὲν καὶ τελευτὴν οὐκ ἔχων τοῦ πάντος αἰῶνος, ἔχων δὲ καὶ περιέχων ἐν αὐτῷ τὸν ἄπειρον χρόνον.

The Christian apologist *Aristides*, from the early 2nd century, says in a summary of divine predicates, as is also found in other writings from the 2nd century,¹⁷⁶ *Apol.* I 4 (preserved only in Syriac translation): “God is a constant nature without beginning and without end” and he later clarifies this with the words: “and what I said, that He is without beginning, means that everything that has a beginning also has an end and what has an end is transitory.” Later in ch. 4 *Aristides* returns to this idea in opposing people who regard heaven as God: “the cosmos is the creation of an artisan”, τὸ κατασκευασθὲν δὲ ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος ἔχει (the Greek text is preserved at this point). The argumentation thus builds on the ideas developed by the above-mentioned philosophers: what is eternal has no beginning and end; what has beginning and end has come into being, is not eternal but transitory.

This is also expressed in the same connection of a very comprehensive list of divine predicates in the recently discovered *Letter of Eugnostos*. According to Krause this is an extra-Christian writing from the 1st or 2nd century, though this is not completely certain. In any case this letter received a Christian revision in the so-called *Sophia Jesu Christi*,¹⁷⁷ but in the process of that there was no intervention in this section. In this description of the Divine Nature with its strongly “negative” character it is said, among other things: “Er ist ungezeugt und hat keinen Anfang. Jeder nämlich, der einen Anfang hat, hat ein Ende” [He is unbegotten and has no beginning. For everyone that has a beginning has an end.], and this last idea is so absurd in relation to God that the “application” does not need to be made. This is why Tatian, *Orat. ad Graecos* 4 and others¹⁷⁸ can say simply that God is ἀναρχος, without mention of “the end”, even if this

176 See my article mentioned above, p. 204 n. 146.

177 W. Foerster, M. Krause & K. Rudolph, *Die Gnosis*, Zürich – Stuttgart 1971, vol. II, p. 35. The text can be found there on p. 37; in the edition by W. Till & H.M. Schenke, *Die gnostischen Schriften*, p. 209 for the *Sophia Jesu Christi*.

178 Listed in the commentary by C. Vona, *L'Apologia di Aristide*, Rome 1950, pp. 72–73.

idea is present by implication. Tatian does add that the latter ἀναρχος... καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπάρχων τῶν ὅλων ἀρχή.

In *Minucius Felix, Octavius* 18.7 we read: “*deum nec principium habere nec terminum*”, which idea returns in 21.11 in these words against the deification of mortals: “*divinum autem id est, quod nec ortum habet nec occasum*”. These two statements occur in the address by the Christian Octavius.

Irenaeus, Adv. Haereses III 8.3 says, after quoting John 1:3, Ps. 33 etc. on the Creator: “*Ipse enim infectus et sine initio et sine fine... quae vero ab eo sunt facta, initium sumserunt. Quaecumque autem initium sumserunt, et dissolutionem possent percipere.*”

Corpus Hermeticum XVI 19: “All things are parts of God; and if all things are parts, then God is everything; God creates himself and so never ceases”, καὶ ὡσπερ ὁ θεὸς οὐ τέλος ἔχει, οὕτως οὐδὲ ἡ ποίησις αὐτοῦ ἀρχὴν ἢ τέλος ἔχει, cf. IV 8 ἀδιάβατον γὰρ τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἀπέραντον καὶ ἀτελές, αὐτῷ δὲ καὶ ἀναρχον. In this last text it is striking how the adjectives that refer to movement in space are employed here. The writer wants to point out, of course, that the Good is a matter of quality and not of quantitatively measurable extent. In the text of Tractate XVI the identity of the Creator and creation is taught; the creation shares in the eternity of the Creator.

Iamblichus, Theol. Arithm., p. 3 de Falco: attribute of the Monad ἑαυτὴν γε μὴν γεννᾷ καὶ ἀφ’ ἑαυτῆς γεννᾶται ὡς αὐτοτελὴς καὶ ἀναρχος καὶ ἀτελεύτητος (see also n. 132a above). Compare also Macrobius, *Comment. in Somnium Scipionis* I 6.7: “*haec monas initium finisque omnium, neque ipsa principia aut finis sciens, ad summum refertur deum.*” Here, then, two formulas are linked.

In the survey above, the texts with the “beginning–end” formula as a divine predicate that I am aware of at present have been assembled and ordered. Although due account needs to be taken of the probability that further material will come to light, nonetheless it is possible to draw a summary conclusion from the available data.

It is then clear that the expression “God *has* the beginning and end (of all things)” describes the omnipotence of this God; the universe is subject to Him, since He embraces it from one extreme to the other. Generally the terms “beginning” and “end” are here viewed in a cosmological sense and not in a temporal sense. The universe lies before God as an entity. In a few Christian texts the chronological is in mind: beginning of creation–end of history, both of which thus lie in God’s hand.

With the *negation*, i.e. that God “has no beginning and end” (or “is without beginning and without end”), a clear line is being followed, as is evident from the texts collected under section (c.) above, as “the divine” is defined as the

infinite in space and time. Anything that *does* have “beginning and end” is by definition non-divine. “Have” in this connection is thus equivalent to “possess the attribute” and not “possess power over something”. That attribute is denied; hence here there is no explicit or implied addition “of all things”.

When it is said that God “*is* the beginning and end”, the perspective is different. Then “beginning” and “end” are the outer limits of “start” and “finish” that are placed on the creation and history that are perceivable by humans. At these limits stands God, as it were; so He, the Eternal One, ultimately forms the point of departure and the end-point. So He also rules the whole. In this regard there is little difference from the idea in which the deity has “beginning and end”, though in the latter case the distance between the deity and the reality embraced by “beginning and end” is, it seems to me, viewed as somewhat greater than in the “is-formula”.

VI

In the preceding sections of this study, all the texts known to me so far are assembled, in which this divine predicate occurs or which are possibly closely related to it. They come from various times and circles and sometimes the assessment of them turned out to be far from straightforward since they are found in pseudepigraphic writings such as the Orphica, and are difficult to date.

Before we finish off our survey it is necessary to take a closer look at two further particular problems. In the first place, it will have been noticed that in the wording used there is a certain amount of variety in relation to the second element, since the alternative terms *τελευτή*, *τέλος* and sometimes *πέρας* are used without there being any immediately discernible difference in meaning; indeed in Philo (see above) *τέλος* and *πέρας* are used in the same connection and it seems that this is nothing more than a variation in usage. On the other hand one has the impression that, to the extent that the texts can be roughly dated, the older texts tend to use *τελευτή* more often, while in the later texts from Hellenistic and Roman times *τέλος* is preferred, though in cases where *τελευτή* is also found later, one has to bear in mind the possibility of quotation, archaizing language or the demands of metre.

Now between these words there is indeed a difference in nuance, even though all of them can be translated as “end”. In his extensive treatment of this complex of synonyms Schmidt gave the following descriptions: “*τέλος* ist die *Vollendung*, der *Abschluss* eines Dinges, wodurch dieses vollständig und in sich abgeschlossen wird . . . *τελευτή* ist der *Endpunkt*, das Ende, womit das

Ding aufhört zu sein... πέρας muss der *Endpunkt*, der *äusserste Punkt* sein, über den man nicht hinweg kommen kann”.¹⁷⁹ These nuances in meaning also seem to fit well in the cases we have reviewed. Where τέλος also has the meaning “goal” and τελευτή is commonly used for “death”, it seems to me likely that for these reasons τέλος was later preferred to τελευτή. If Philo (see above) can explain the expression *archē kai telos* with the imagery of the race track, it is self-evident that τέλος brings this goal to mind. It is of course perfectly obvious that the combination “God is τελευτή” can lead to misunderstandings, which can be avoided with τέλος.

A second problem to which some attention must be devoted lies in the fact that both a formula with three elements and one with two are found (Josephus knows and uses both). According to Delling, who takes the two-term formula as his starting point, a shift in the idea occurs when God is said to be also “the middle”, “denn dann wird er ja ganz in das geschichtliche Geschehen hineingesehen” rather than connected with infinity.¹⁸⁰ When put like this, in my view there is a misunderstanding, because the emphasis is laid so strongly on the *temporal* aspect that it practically dominates everything. In reviewing the text material, however, it appeared that in the understanding of those who use the formula, the *spatial* aspect in particular predominates. In my view, the insertion of the term “the middle” was an attempt to underline clearly that absolutely *nothing* falls outside the all-embracing power.

In connection with this question it is interesting to point to a parallel that occurs with another polarity that is also of significance for our texts in the Apocalypse of John, namely with the expression “the First and the Last”. With reference to Theognis I 3–4, ἀλλ’ αἰεὶ πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον ἔν τε μέσοισιν // αἰείσω—words addressed to Apollo—Van Groningen in his commentary gave a number of parallels for both the three-term and the two-term wording,¹⁸¹ both of which express the same thing. It is also notable here that in the examples cited of the three-term formula, the word “middle” is found at the end, just as it is in the “old saying” quoted by Plato, *Leges* IV 715E (see above).¹⁸²

179 J.H.H. Schmidt, *Synonymik der griechischen Sprache*, Leipzig 1886, vol. IV, p. 195.

180 G. Delling, ἀρχή, in: Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. I, p. 478, n. 4. Delling is incorrect to adduce the text of Plato, *Leges* IV 715E–716A since according to the latter God “has”, not “is”, beginning, end and middle.

181 B.A. van Groningen, *Theognis, Le premier livre*, in: Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde, n.s. vol. 72, 1, Amsterdam 1966, p. 9: however, the texts dealt with here are not mentioned there.

182 Cf. O. Weinreich, “Aion in Eleusis”, p. 180; he says simply: “Gott als Anfang, Ende und Mitte zu bezeichnen ist seitdem (i.e. since Plato, *Leges* IV 715E–716A) üblich und erstreckt sich

Everything points to the fact that the original starting point was the polarity¹⁸³ “beginning and end”, but that this was later supplemented in some cases with “the middle”, the logical sequence being taken into account in a later stage (see above).

In the light of these considerations it is strange and striking that where Philo (see above) speaks of God as “beginning and end”, he deliberately keeps to these *two* terms. In his comparison with the race track, God is start and finish, while “the middle” is the place for the “runners”, i.e. for human activity. Implicitly, but deliberately, then, preference is given to the two-term version of the divine predicate over the three-term version to give space to human responsibility within the framework of God’s government. This shows that both Philo and Josephus (see above) take τέλος in the sense of ultimate *goal*, which gives rise to a shift in meaning or at least a change of emphasis. As a result the words, which generally indicate the boundaries and express by their shape the all-encompassing power of God, gain a much tighter and more focused meaning.

In this discussion we have directed our attention only to those texts in which the combination “beginning and end” is used in some form in a divine predicate by people in Graeco-Roman Antiquity. That this pair of terms is also frequently applied in relation to other realms of life, is obvious. But since the combination of this phrase with God gives it a special turn, it was necessary to pay special attention to that combination.

In the light of the material discussed above one cannot simply say with A. Dihle: “Polare Ausdrücke wie ‘Anfang und Ende’ zur Bezeichnung der Totalität oder Dauer sind der archaischen, volkstümlichen und poetischen Diktion in vielen Sprachen geläufig.”¹⁸⁴ The latter may well be correct, but it seems to me incorrect to limit the formula in the ancient world to the three above-mentioned fields and then to continue: “Dass τέλος Ende innerhalb eines solchen Ausdrucks einen Widerspruch zur Vorstellung von der Ewigkeit Gottes ergibt, empfindet nur ein in irgendeiner Weise von der Philosophie beeinflusstes Denken.”

Certainly, we found the predicate with a negative prefix in the writings of various philosophers, but equally we find philosophers or people who have

bis in die religiöse Sprache der Gegenwart”. But this sequence is still strange, and, as we saw above, changed to a more “logical” order.

183 On this see E. Kemmer, *Die polare Ausdrucksweise in der griechischen Literatur*, Würzburg 1903, who however did not deal with the pair “beginning and end”.

184 A. Dihle, quoted in G. Delling, τέλος, in: Kittel & Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. VIII, p. 56 n. 45.

come into contact with philosophy, like Josephus, speaking of God as the one who “possesses beginning and end” or “is beginning and end”. It is essential to make clear distinctions here, as we have done in the study above.

Whenever God is said to *have* beginning and end (and middle), what is meant is that He has power over everything in his hands. So it is clearly a description of God’s almighty power. When, however, He is said to “have no beginning and end”, the thought relates to God’s own being, which is unlimited.

The statement that God “is beginning and end (and middle)” should not be viewed with Norden, appealing to Weinreich,¹⁸⁵ as an “Umschreibung von Aiōn” (“Ewigkeitsformel”, Weinreich calls it). In the well-known text from the Magical Papyrus (see above) it is also clearly associated with dominion. From Philo it is very clear where he got the expression from, namely from the circle of Pythagoraeans. He was certainly aware of this provenance. Other data too provide evidence of a connection with this religio-philosophical current. That the Jewish-Alexandrian thinker and preacher borrows this formula, provided with such a strange argumentation as he offers in *de Plantatione*, is a significant datum in the history of the use of this predicate. It should be remembered that in Philo the formula relates to God’s dominion over human life.

It is regrettable that (to date?) the origin of the prayer in the Magical Papyrus cannot be determined. In any case: if one wants to date it before the 2nd century CE one must adduce decent arguments. It is, however, possible to infer from this text and those in the Orphic Hymns that this predicate had a certain dissemination in religious circles, but how far this extended is difficult to deduce from the few data. That the contact with the Pythagoraeans is not visible means little or nothing of course, as it must be borne in mind that a good many years had passed since the days of Philo.

In the environment of early Christianity this form of the predicate, at least as far as is known, is found perhaps only in the Gnostic *Apocryphon of John* (see above). There, despite the use in the Apocalypse of John, it had no subsequent take-up. In the many divine predicates used by Christian authors, it does not occur. From Origen (see below, pp. 232–35) it is apparent that said of Jesus it

185 E. Norden, *Die Geburt des Kindes*, Darmstadt 21958, p. 50, with an appeal to Weinreich, “Aion in Eleusis”, pp. 180ff. The so-called “Religionsgespräch am Hofe der Sassaniden”, which Norden also mentions, because there in the annunciation of the birth (related to Jesus) there is talk of a Child “dessen Name ist ‘Anfang und Ende’”, dates from the 5th or 6th century, at any rate after 430 CE (on this work see O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der alt-kirchlichen Literatur*, 1932, vol. V, pp. 151–152). Whether much can be done with this is an open question. In any case one has to beware of religio-historical alchemy, which is what Norden’s passage rather looks like. Influence from the Revelation of John is likely.

is borrowed from the Revelation of John. We must, on the contrary, conclude that among Christians the negative wording gained precedence. With all due caution one can still infer something for the history of dissemination of the predicate, namely its confinement to the 1st–early 2nd century.

VII

Let us now return to our point of departure, the use of the divine predicate “The Beginning and the End” in Flavius Josephus and the Revelation of John, in the last decades of the 1st century.

The investigation of this in itself simple formula led us along all manner of winding pathways, since it was necessary to examine diverse data that had been brought to the table unsorted and without further evaluation. It turned out that we needed to give attention also to texts emanating from Orphic and Pythagorean circles, with all the uncertainties that accompany these pseudepigrapha.

No use was made of data from Jewish sources other than the Jewish-Hellenistic authors Philo and Josephus, for the simple reason that there are no indications to be found there that the predicate “the Beginning and the End” is associated with God. The only text that displays a certain relationship with this is the statement by Rabbi Resh Laqish in *Genesis Rabba* 81 (52a)¹⁸⁶ (see also above), but this dates from the middle of the 3rd century CE. It gives an “explanation” of the name “Truth” (*emet*) for God, which is also explicated elsewhere.¹⁸⁷ The notable thing here is that Isa 44:6 is also given as a Bible text, since the same connection is found in Eusebius (see above). Must we assume that this agreement between both scholars has been brought about independently, which is certainly possible, considering their familiarity with the Bible, or are they relying on a common tradition? Even if the latter is the case, there is no evidence at all that it is older than the 3rd century. This text cannot, therefore, be used in the discussion concerning the authors of interest to us here. The opinion of Reinach mentioned earlier (see above) seems worthwhile considering, but it implies that the rabbi concerned came into contact with Greek terminology in one way or another.¹⁸⁸

186 Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, vol. III, p. 789; see also vol. II, p. 362.

187 Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, vol. II, p. 362.

188 This is not intrinsically surprising since there are more indications that Hellenistic culture did not completely pass rabbinic circles by; see S. Liebermann, *Hellenism in Jewish*

On the use that Josephus makes of this predicate we can be brief in this concluding survey, since detailed attention has already been paid to the way in which the formula is discussed in his writings (see above).

Because of the connection that some scholars have made between the statement in *c. Apion.* II 190 and the “old saying” in Plato, *Leges* IV 715E, I initially toyed with the idea of giving this article the title “Orphic influence on Josephus?” But on closer examination it emerged that there is no direct relationship between the two texts. The Jewish apologist clearly borrowed the predicate that God “is the beginning, middle and end” from elsewhere, probably from Pythagorean circles. He could apply this clearly elevated, respected saying to Israel’s God because, as his work *Antiquitates Judaicae* in the first place shows, he was sure that this God is the origin of the world through His work of Creation, that He guided history, in particular that of His people Israel through all its confusion and sin, and that He is also the ultimate goal, because “everything has piety as goal”¹⁸⁹ and life culminates in union with God.¹⁹⁰

Alongside this we have the passage in *Ant.* VIII 280. Here the predicate comes to the fore at a very cardinal point, namely in the choice facing the people between idolatry and veneration of the true God. It should be kept in mind that the historian Josephus does not simply retell Old Testament history as an old story but that for him this had contemporary significance.¹⁹¹ One must, he preaches, choose *this* God, who is “beginning and end of all things” because life which came from Him also finds its fulfilment in Him and in a right relationship with Him, the *eusebeia* which embraces the whole of life.¹⁹²

It cannot be said that this predicate occupies a place of prominence in Josephus, but it certainly occurs in very striking contexts. He betrays the fact that in certain circles, those to whom his apologetic preaching was addressed,

Palestine: Studies in the Literary Transmission, Beliefs and Manners of Palestine in the I Century B.C.E.–IV Century C.E., New York 1950.

189 Josephus, *c. Apion.* II 181 δεῖ πάντα ἅλλα τέλος ἔχειν τὴν εὐσέβειαν. Cf. also Philo, above, pp. 214–15.

190 Cf. Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* I 231 ἐκείνου (sc. God) ψυχὴν τὴν σὴν προσδεζομένου καὶ παρ’ αὐτῷ καθέξοντος (a word by Abraham to Isaac at the moment when he is about to sacrifice the latter); see A. Schlatter, *Theologie des Judentums*, pp. 259–260 and the chapter in that book devoted to “Die Frömmigkeit” (pp. 96–158).

191 An example of this working method is dealt with in my article mentioned in on p. 164 n. 29 above.

192 Cf. Josephus, *c. Apion.* II 170–171, where the special, unique quality of Moses’ legislation is said to be that the latter embraced the whole of life and not just a part of it: ἅπασαι γὰρ αἱ πράξεις καὶ διατριβαὶ καὶ λόγοι πάντες ἐπὶ τὴν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν εὐσέβειαν ἔχουσι τὴν ἀναφοράν. οὐδὲν γὰρ τούτων ἀνεξέταστον οὐδ’ ἀόριστον παρέλιπεν.

it was in currency as a term for the Most High. Where this can also be said of the God of his people, Josephus seeks to generate reverence for this God, whose temple is ruined, whose people is scattered and who, despite everything, is still "beginning and end". It can and must be said, not of other gods, but of the God of Abraham and Moses. This also called the Jewish people back to this God, for in Him hope remains.¹⁹³

Rather more detailed comments are called for on the use of the term in the book of *Revelation*, especially since the recently published commentary by H. Kraft gives no more than a few superficial comments on the verses in which the formula in question occurs.¹⁹⁴ The material which his predecessor Ernst Lohmeyer adduced in his exposition in the *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*¹⁹⁵ is not referred to by Kraft, possibly because he regarded his work as a supplement to that of his predecessor, familiarity with which could be taken for granted. But a critical sifting of the data provided by Lohmeyer would not have been superfluous, as we showed above. On Rev 21:6 Kraft has no more to say than a sort of reiterative description: "Gott ist Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte; er gibt den Dingen ihren Anfang und ihr Ende"¹⁹⁶ and on 22:13 that the "Selbstbezeichnungen Gottes" are borrowed in some cases verbatim and in some cases in periphrastic form from Deutero-Isaiah and that here Christ is referring to himself as "Schöpfer und Weltenrichter".¹⁹⁷ In light of the preceding investigation, however, much more than this can be said.

We have seen that no texts from the Old Testament or other Jewish writings in the immediate environment of the New Testament can be cited for the combination *archē kai telos* other than from Philo and Josephus, in whose work, however, it is evident that they are appropriating a term current among their non-Jewish contemporaries for their preaching of Israel's God. Besides these, this divine predicate is found, certainly not frequently but still very clearly, in pagan texts, some of which are situated both geographically and chronologically in the proximity of the Johannine Apocalypse.

Here it is striking that both times the term is used it follows the reference to God as the *Alpha kai Omega*. To date the origin of this combination of letters has still not been satisfactorily clarified. Scholars are generally content to regard it as being clarified by the following expressions, so that the same thing

193 See the apt words directed to Jerusalem as it faces its certain fall, in *Bell. Jud.* V 19: δύναιτο δ' ἂν γενέσθαι πάλιν ἀμείνων, εἴγε ποτέ τὸν πορθήσαντα θεὸν ἐξιλάσῃ.

194 H. Kraft, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, Tübingen 1974.

195 See p. 167 above.

196 H. Kraft, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

197 H. Kraft, *op. cit.*, p. 279.

is said two or three times. This would not, in itself, be surprising for the last book of the Bible, with its many parallelisms. Repetition gave emphasis and confirmed the hieratic character. But then the question arises, where this *Alpha and Omega* comes from: is this the author's own invention, or is he borrowing it from somewhere? If the former is the case, then it must be being used in a circle that appreciated such letter symbolism. Such scholars as Reitzenstein and Boll were correct long ago to point to Hellenistic mysticism.¹⁹⁸ Should we, or might we think of Pythagorean circles at this point? If the additions indicate repetition at all, then this surely signifies a sharpening of meaning.¹⁹⁹

For the words "the first and the last" (see above) reference is generally made to Isa 44:6 and other texts from Deutero-Isaiah. This is entirely appropriate.²⁰⁰ But two comments should be made on this:

a. There, in the Septuagint, we read ἐγὼ πρῶτος καὶ ἐγὼ μετὰ ταῦτα or other expressions that lie even further away from the ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος that we read in the Apocalypse. Now one may assume that the author of Revelation used a different Greek translation or changed it himself, in any event this is a linguistic improvement. It is as well to keep in mind, and in my view this gives this alteration a typical connotation, that ἔσχατος does not simply mean the last chronologically but also the most outstanding one, the top figure.²⁰¹

b. Parallels in which a deity is said to be "the first and the last" can also be adduced from Greek literature. From this material, listed by Van Groningen, I cite only Hesiod, *Theog.* 34: σφᾶς (the Muses) πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον (sc. the race of the blessed gods) αἰὲν αἰεῖδεν and *Theognis* I 1146 Ἑλπίδι τε πρώτῃ καὶ

198 F. Boll, *Aus der Offenbarung Johannis*, Leipzig – Berlin 1914, p. 27 with references to the work of Reitzenstein.

199 It is not exactly clear to me what G. Delling (τέλος, in: Kittel & Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. VIII, p. 56) means with the words: "formal interpretiert sie die vorangehenden Verbindungen Α und Ω bzw πρῶτος und ἔσχατος, sachlich ist sie nicht ohne diese zu verstehen." Why is the latter impossible?

200 Cf. Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, vol. III, p. 796.

201 J.H.H. Schmidt (*Synonymik*, vol. IV, p. 527) refers to Plutarch, *Vit. Philopoemenos* 1.4: Ῥωμαίων δέ τις ἐπαινῶν ἔσχατον αὐτὸν Ἑλλήνων προσεῖπεν, ὡς οὐδένα μέγαν μετὰ τοῦτον ἔτι τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἄνδρα γειναμένης οὐδὲ αὐτῆς ἄξιον; cf. also *Vita Bruti* 44.1, where Brutus weeps for the deceased Cassius: προσαγορεύσας ἔσχατον ἄνδρα Ῥωμαίων τὸν Κάσσιον ὡς οὐκ ἔτι τῇ πόλει τηλικούτου φρονήματος ἐγγενέσθαι δυναμένου, and *Vita Arati* 24.2 οἱ μὲν οὖν Ῥωμαῖοι τὸν Φιλοποίμενα θαυμάζοντες Ἑλλήνων ἔσχατον προσηγόρευον, ὡς μηδενὸς μεγάλου μετ' ἐκείνου ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλήσι γενομένου. These more precise and informative explanations introduced by ὡς show clearly that ἔσχατος did not have an exclusively chronological meaning.

πυμάτη θυέτω.²⁰² Besides these texts from early Greek literature I am unable at present to note any passages from the Hellenistic and Roman period, but no doubt these will come to light in due course.²⁰³ Be that as it may, I thought it important to signal this question, even if further research is required. In any event there is the possibility that a divine predicate is being used in a notable way, a predicate that was known in both the Old Testament world and the Greek world and could find resonance.

Whether this is the case or not, however, the *archē kai telos* formula certainly takes up terminology that was current in the Hellenistic world in those days. This is not an isolated case in the Johannine Apocalypse. On the contrary, in various passages it is evident that the author is *au fait* with the terminology of his Greek contemporaries.²⁰⁴ This is particularly striking in this book, whose language is so permeated with expressions and imagery derived from the Old

202 B.A. van Groningen, *Theognis*, p. 9. During the correction of the proofs of this article, my colleague Drs. P.W. van der Horst drew my attention to an interesting parallel in Cornutus (c. 50 CE), *Theologiae Graecae Compendium* 28: μυθεύεται (sc. Hestia) δὲ πρώτη τε καὶ ἐσχάτη γενέσθαι τῷ εἰς ταύτην ἀναλύεσθαι τὰ ἀπ' αὐτῆς γινόμενα καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς συνίστασθαι, καθὼς καὶ ἄν θυσίαις οἱ Ἕλληνες ἀπὸ πρώτης τε αὐτῆς ἤρχοντο καὶ εἰς ἐσχάτην αὐτὴν κατέπαυον. In relation to this last note cf. Hom. *Hymn* 29.5 πρώτη πυμάτη τε/ Ἔστίη ἀρχόμενος σπένδει μελιγδέα οἶνον, with the comments of T.W. Allen, W.R. Holliday & E.E. Sikes, *The Homeric Hymns*, Oxford 21936 (repr. Amsterdam 1963), pp. 428f.

203 Given our present state of knowledge with regard to provenance, date and background, nothing much can be done in this connection with the text from the *Mandaean Book of Prayers* cited by Lohmeyer (see above, p. 167 n. 41). A more detailed analysis would be necessary for this, for example looking for an answer to the question to what extent this prayer is “home-grown” among the Mandaeans or inspired by Hellenistic models; see e.g. in the lines that precede the quotation the words: “Thou art immeasurable, infinite and everlasting”, which look very much like predicates current in the Greek world; see above, pp. 188–89. A saying in the book *Nebronte* in the Nag Hammadi library (*The Thunder, Perfect Mind*), in: M. Krause & P. Labib, *Gnostische und Hermetische Schriften aus Codex II und Codex VI*, Glückstadt 1971, p. 122: “Denn ich bin die Erste und die Letzte”, is not a parallel, since from the following text, “Ich bin die Geehrte und die Verachtete. Ich bin die Dirne und die Ehrbare”, it is evident that in this opposition “the last” has the meaning “the least”. It is, of course, possible that the author of this writing borrowed an existing formula that originally meant something different, and interpreted it in his own way, but there is no clear evidence for this and it cannot be simply assumed.

204 See the book by Boll referred to above. In the course of my studies I have come across this phenomenon a number of times; in addition to my article cited on p. 202 n. 140 above, see also: “De la règle Μῆτε προσθεῖναι μήτε ἀφελεῖν dans l’histoire du Canon”, *Vigiliae Christianae* 2 (1949), pp. 1–36; “Worthy is the Lamb”, *The Background of Apoc. 5*, in *Mélanges-Béda Rigaux*, Bruges 1970, pp. 445–461; “ΜΙΑ ΓΝΩΜΗ, Apoc. of John XVII 13,17”, in: *Studies in John, presented to Professor Dr. J.N. Sevenster*, Leiden 1970, pp. 209–220.

Testament and Jewish apocalyptic, especially as the data that indicate this are so unobtrusive and only come to light in comparisons with the “environment”. For a correct characterization of the writer and his *Sitz im Leben*, attention needs to be paid to this in the future.

The predicate is used in Revelation without further explanation. From the other texts in which it appears it is clear that it is a circumlocution for the all-embracing power of God. In this regard it is perhaps important to note that in 1:8 alongside “Alpha and Omega” we find ὁ παντοκράτωρ, an appellation regularly used for God further on in the book (4:8; 11:17; 15:3; 16:7, 14; 19:6, 15; 21:22).²⁰⁵ It must be further taken into account that in Philo and Josephus this formula is also used to indicate that God is the departure point and goal of everything. This idea is also present in this case. It is not without reason, in my view, that this term for God and Jesus Christ is mentioned at the end of Revelation. God was the origin; cf. the praise of God in 4:11: “for you created all things and by your will they existed and were created” and Christ is “the beginning of God’s creation” (3:14). But the turbulent history of the world, as painted in the pictures presented in Revelation, does not lead to complete chaos and destruction, nor does it end in a new kingdom of human construction, but in the New Jerusalem that comes to the earth, with God and Jesus Christ at its centre. The Apocalypticist adopts a term from the religious vocabulary of his day and says to his readers: what is stated concerning a variety of gods applies to the fullest extent to this God!

It is indeed striking that the formula is not used here as a human statement about God, or addressed to God, but occurs as a self-revelation of God. In this regard the Revelation of John is unique among the other comparable texts that have been brought forward for discussion. It is not humans that declare this, confessing it as the sum of their considerations or hope, but with these words God and Christ themselves express their relation to the world and proclaim themselves as the ultimate goal. In this connection it is perhaps not insignificant either that this statement is followed in both cases by a blessing and a curse: 21:7; 22:14 (blessing) and 21:8; 22:15 (curse). These are of course promises and warnings for those who hear “the words of the prophecy of this book” (22:8; cf. also 1:3). This points to what the “end” is for those who follow God’s way or depart from it. But is it coincidental that these promises and curse follow this divine predicate? Is it simply the application of the well-known scheme of blessing and curse that occurs so commonly in the Bible? In my

The remarkable thing here was that the Hellenistic background was not being deliberately looked for, but simply presented itself.

205 W. Michaelis, παντοκράτωρ, in: Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. III, pp. 913–914.

view the connection is even closer. I would want to remind my readers of the text from Plato discussed in detail above, *Leges* IV 715E ff. For there the philosopher cites that “old saying” that *Dikē* accompanies the God who controls beginning, end and middle, and he gives an explanation and elaboration of it which is directly related to human conduct of life. To what extent this connection was still made in the time before the Apocalypse is beyond our ability to discern, given our present state of knowledge; but in view of the familiarity enjoyed by this text in the ancient world, it is not impossible. We may also imagine that the figure of *Dikē* in God’s retinue who “has beginning, end and middle of everything” drew much attention (see above). The writer of Revelation would then not only have borrowed the divine predicate but would also have been able to appeal to notions associated with it.

In the polar combination “the beginning and the end of all things” the individual in Antiquity is concerned with the ultimate questions of human life and the world, of existence and history. When this formula is linked with the name of a god, people are confessing the omnipotence of God and thus human security and responsibility. Here with a formula from a different source the same thing is being said as Paul expressed with many contemporaries in the words: “from Him and through Him and to Him are all things” (Rom 11:36).²⁰⁶ The usage in Josephus and the Apocalypse forms a valuable, well-fixed point in the history of this confession that God “is beginning and end of all things”.

This point is all the more remarkable because, as far as we are able to determine, this predicate was not taken up in Christian theology later. Where it is mentioned it is as a quotation from the Apocalypse, but not on its own.

Josephus and John show, however, that at the end of the 1st century this formula was current in the circles they were addressing. These environments were extremely varied; the fact that both the Jewish apologist and the Christian apocalypticist were nonetheless able to make use of this predicate reveals how widespread it was. They could appeal to it and so say in a manner understandable by their contemporaries who the God of Abraham and Moses was, and who the Father of Jesus Christ was. In their lives, subject to so many uncertainties and vicissitudes, in the words that God “is the beginning and the end of all things” they expressed their trust in the God who does not forsake the work of His hands (cf. Ps 138:8).

206 Cf. the notes of Norden, Lietzmann and Michaelis mentioned on p. 210 n. 160 above.

Appendix

Following on to the discussion on pp. 171–73 we list here a few passages where *Clement of Alexandria* and *Origen* note the combination of “Beginning and End” as a divine predicate, generally in clear association with the texts of the Revelation of John.

a. Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus* I 6.36.1: In a passage in which the author is speaking of the symbol of the “milk” with which believers are fed, he quotes Paul’s words in 1 Cor 3:1–2; this feeding is the beginning of faith in Christ: but then a difficulty arises, why in God’s promise for his people (e.g. Exod 3:8, 17) there is talk of “the land of milk and honey”.²⁰⁷ Milk is then the spiritual food. Clement therefore says: οὕτω γοῦν τελεία τροφή τὸ γάλα ἐστὶ τὸ τέλειον καὶ εἰς τέλος. Naturally the Lord promises milk to the righteous ἵνα δὴ σαφῶς ὁ λόγος ἄμφοι δειχθῇ, ἄλφα καὶ ὦ, ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος. Here, then, the predicate from the Revelation of John is clearly used and borrowed from there. By combining Paul’s words about milk as food for infants with the Old Testament promise of the land of the future, where milk will flow, Clement is able to see Christ, the Logos, who gives the spiritual drink = milk, as the beginning and end of the life of the Christian.

b. Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus* II 8.75.2: in the context of a discussion of the crown²⁰⁸ Clement also speaks of the crown of thorns with which Jesus was crowned during His mocking by the Roman soldiers (Matt 27:29 parr.). Clement relates this episode to the epiphany of the burning bush²⁰⁹ in Exod 3, of which he gives a mystical explanation: at His end He was crowned with thorns in a mystical way “departing from here to the place whence He came down, ἀνακεφαλαιούμενος τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς καθόδου τῆς παλαιᾶς, so that He, who first appeared through the bramble bush, the Logos, and later was taken

207 On this see N.A. Dahl, “La terre où coulent le lait et le miel selon Barnabé 6,8–19,” in: *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne, Mélanges M. Goguel*, Paris 1950, pp. 62–70.

208 On this topic see K. Baus, *Der Kranz in Antike und Christentum*, Bonn 1940, with the references given in the Index, p. 234, s.v. Klemens von Alex.

209 Βάτος = thorn bush; see W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*, Berlin ⁵1958, col. 273. For Clement it is essential that this was a thorn bush. In the edition by O. Stählin & U. Treu, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, vol. I, *Protrepticus und Paedagogus*, Berlin ³1972, p. 203, note ad 1.17 and by H.I. Marrou in: C. Mondésert & H.I. Marrou, *Clément d’Alexandrie, Le Pédagogue, Livre II*, Paris 1965, p. 149 n. 10, reference is made to the remark by Philo, *De Vita Mosi* I 65, who states this explicitly: Βάτος ἦν, ἀκανθῶδες τι φυτόν.

up to heaven through the crown of thorns, might show the whole to be the work of one power, being one from the One Being, the Father, ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος αἰῶνος.”

Here, then, the Old Testament history is not a “type” of Christ’s suffering, but the revelation in the thorns of the bramble bush and the crowning with thorns belong together as “beginning and end” of the revelation of the one Logos on earth. One could say that, according to Clement, realized here in the history of the Logos Jesus is what is said in a well-known apocryphal quotation: “See, I make the last the first” (*Barnabas* 6.13),²¹⁰ even though that saying has an eschatological meaning. But the “beginning and end” of this revelation points to the fact that the One Logos of the Only God (the core confession of both Jew and Christian; cf. Deut 6:4; Mark 12:29, 32; Rom 3:30; Eph 4:6) is the “beginning and end of the world”.

c. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* IV 25.156.2–157.1: the Son is one and all; κύκλος γὰρ ὁ αὐτὸς πασῶν τῶν δυνάμεων εἰς ἓν εἰλουμένων καὶ ἐνούμενων. The Logos is called “Alpha and Omega” because οὐ μόνου τὸ τέλος ἀρχὴ γίνεται καὶ τελευτᾷ πάλιν ἐπὶ τὴν ἄνωθεν ἀρχήν, οὐδαμοῦ διάστασιν λαβών. There is thus a clear connection here with Rev 22:13, the mysterious reference to “Alpha and Omega” being explained by “beginning and end”, which link together as in a circle. For this image cf. the quotations on pp. 198–99. He thus encompasses the Universe. This is why Clement makes out of this the application for Christians, that belief in and through Him means becoming a “unity” (μοναδικόν), but unbelief means division and separation. This recalls the Pythagorean views as they are found in Philo (see above, pp. 212–15) and which were known to Clement.²¹¹

d. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* VII 10.55.5–6, where there is talk of the different steps that lead to perfection, of the relationship between faith, wisdom and knowledge. Clement then says that not doubt about God but belief is the foundation of Knowledge, continuing: ἄμφω δὲ ὁ Χριστὸς ὃ τε θεμέλιος ἢ τε ἐποικοδομή, δι’ οὗ καὶ ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὰ τέλη. καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄκρα οὐ διδάσκεται. ἢ τε ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος, πίστις λέγω καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη, ἡ γνῶσις δὲ ἐκ παραδόσεως, “which

210 On this text see the commentary of H. Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief*, Tübingen 1920, p. 337.

211 My understanding of this differs from the interpretation of S.R.C. Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism*, Oxford 1971, p. 206, who sees in the *Hen* the centre of the circle. Space limitations prevent me from following up this problem further, because this would require a much more detailed treatment of the Monad, the Logos doctrine and the relationship to the Pythagorean views of Clement. In the context of this article we must content ourselves with the references mentioned in the text which illuminate the relationship to understandings of “beginning and end”.

is conveyed through the grace of God to those who show themselves worthy of the teaching as a deposit is placed, from which (teaching) the worth of love beams forth from light to light". As indicated in the edition by Stählin, Früchtel and Treu,²¹² Clement is playing here on Paul's imagery in Eph 2:20, but also on the words of Ignatius *Eph.* 14.2, discussed above:²¹³ ἀρχὴ μὲν πίστις, τέλος δὲ ἀγάπη. So through Christ is thus the foundation = faith and what is built upon it; He also gives the extremes, namely faith and love, but when Clement says that these are not "learned" like Knowledge, he means by this that they do not come by means of intellectual teaching, in the way that Knowledge is gained through the tradition of the church, though one must show oneself "worthy" of them.²¹⁴ So this is not a matter of a predicate for God or Christ, though there is no mistaking a certain parallelism between "foundation-building" and "beginning-end". But this lies more in the personal sphere of the life of the Christian with Christ. ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος are clearly meant here as the "point of departure" and "culmination" of a line of development; hence they are also called "extremes"; between them lies the "transmission of Knowledge" as human communication.

e. Finally we should mention Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* VI 16.141.7, where all that is said is that the Lord is also called Alpha and Omega, ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος, i.e. the appellation from the Apocalypse, which is explained by Clement with the words from the Gospel of John 1:3: "All things came into being through Him, and without Him not one thing came into being." So here the words seem to be an appellation borrowed from the Bible which was evidently not in circulation as an independent divine predicate. The explanation with the text from the Gospel thus points to an understanding of "beginning and end" as a reference to the one who called the universe in its totality fully into being.

The treatment of our subject by *Origen*, a great scholar of the Bible and philosophy in his day, is particularly interesting. In the first book of his

212 O. Stählin, L. Früchtel & U. Treu, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, vol. III, Berlin 21970, p. 41 n. and p. 232.

213 J.B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers, Part II, S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp*, London 21889, vol. I, did not include this passage among the "coincidences which suggest that this father [Clement of Alexandria] was acquainted with the Ignatian letters"; nor did A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, Part I, *Die Überlieferung und der Bestand der altchristlichen Literatur bei Eusebius*, Leipzig 1893, p. 79; but Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 67 did refer in his note on Ignatius *Eph.* 14.2 to this text from Clement, as did W. Bauer, *Ignatiusbriefe*, p. 213.

214 On this notion of "worthiness", which played a prominent part in religious affairs of the time, see my article, "Worthy is the Lamb: The Background of Apoc. 5," in: *Mélanges-B. Rigaux*, Bruges 1970, pp. 451ff.

commentary on the Gospel of John he discusses in considerable detail the various names given to Jesus in the New Testament (chs. 22–39). In the course of this, in *Comment. in Joh.* I 31 he deals with the names of Jesus in Rev 22:13. Three features of this discussion are immediately evident. First, the fact that the reference to “Alpha and Omega” etc. is associated only with Jesus, so interpreted Christologically, while Origen never mentions that earlier the same words are associated with God Himself (see above). The reasons for this omission are obscure. Secondly, the reader is struck by the fact that right at the beginning of this piece the old doctor of the church raises the question of the specific meaning of each of the three terms.²¹⁵ He does not assume, as is customary today (see above, p. ?) that they are all really expressions of the same thing. Now it is of course possible that Origen was wrong to do this, but in any case, despite his sophistication²¹⁶ he did not immediately see an agreement. Perhaps he was keen to see many different deep meanings in the text; but be that as it may, he began by making distinctions. Thirdly, it is striking that the name “Beginning and End” has come to him from, and is known to him only from, the Revelation of John. He does not cite a word from the religious or philosophical literature of the Greeks at this point.

Origen first gives a detailed discussion of the term “the First and the Last”, saying that this does not mean that Jesus does not embrace what lies between them, but that the extremes are mentioned to show that He became everything. This “everything” means here all beings in heaven, on earth and in the underworld, as is set out using such texts as Exod 3:2, 6 and Ps 88:4, 5 (§§219–220). Origen’s comments on the term “Alpha and Omega” are much briefer (§221). There are divine letters which the saints read on the “heavenly tablets”,²¹⁷ the elements through which heavenly things are read; the notions are divided in small pieces, in the letters Alpha and so on to Omega, “the son of God”. I must confess that the meaning of the last words, which are evidently related by the grammatical construction (a genitive) to the Omega, escapes me.

215 Origen, *Comment. in Joh.* I 31, §209: “Further, we have to ask in what sense He is called in the Apocalypse the First and the Last, and how, in His character as the First, He is not the same as the Alpha and the beginning, while in His character as the Last He is not the same as the Omega and the end.”

216 Cf. the famous witness of Porphyry concerning Origen, ap. Eusebius, *H.E.* VI 19.7: “educated as a Greek in Greek literature”.

217 For this view of Origen see L. Koep, *Das himmlische Buch in Antike und Christentum*, Bonn 1952, pp. 42–44. The “heavenly tablets” are known from Jewish apocalyptic literature; see e.g. 1 *Enoch* 93.2, where Enoch says, “... what I have learned from the heavenly tablets”; *Test. Levi* 5.4, “And in that day I destroyed the sons of Hamor, as is written on the heavenly tablets”; cf. further the material in L. Koep, *op. cit.*, pp. 25–27.

But then in §§222–225 comes a clarification of the words “Beginning and End”. Origen gives two explanations. He notes that Jesus is not “Beginning and End” in all aspects of His activity in the same way. He points to the difference between the text of Proverbs 8:22, so important in Christological discussions, “God created me (wisdom) as the beginning (*archē*) of His ways” and John 1:1, “In the beginning was the Logos”; Christ as wisdom is thus the Beginning, but as Logos He is “*in* the beginning”, i.e. after it; and so it continues to the end. Origen then gives the example: Beginning inasmuch as wisdom; second inasmuch as invisible; third inasmuch as life. So anyone qualified to discern the sense of Scripture might find many members of the series “and the end”; but Origen does not believe that they will all be found. This concluding comment to the first explanation betrays a certain resignation. He began with *Archē* as a Christological reference, but evidently could not see exactly how he could resolve this further and reach the “end”.²¹⁸

Hence he quickly moves on to the second explanation, which he introduces with the words: “I think that ‘the beginning and the end’ is a more usual phrase we apply to a thing that is a completed unity; the beginning of a house is its foundation and the end the parapet (on the roof).”²¹⁹ With reference to Paul’s words in Eph 2:20 he says that Christ is the cornerstone for the whole united body of the saved.²²⁰ “For Christ the only-begotten Son is ‘all’ and ‘in all’ (1 Cor 15:28), He is as the beginning in the man He assumed, He is present as the end in the last of the saints, and He is also in those between, or else He is present as the beginning in Adam, as the end in His life on earth, according to the saying: ‘The last Adam was made a quickening spirit’” (1 Cor 15:45).

218 He uses a very curious turn of phrase in this passage, §224: εἴ τις ἱκανὸς βασανίζων τὸν νοῦν τῶν γραφῶν ὁρᾷν, τάχα εὐρήσει πολλὰ τῆς τάξεως καὶ τὸ τέλος. οὐκ οἶμαι τὰρ ὅτι πάντα. What is the exact meaning of βασανίζων here? It can of course be “investigate scientifically”, but it also often has the meaning “question by applying torture” (see Liddell, Scott & Jones, *Greek Lexicon*, p. 308). Is there a connotation of “squeezing out the meaning”? There is a stronger suggestion of this when we note how Origen introduces the second explanation in the sentence that follows: σαφέστερον δ’ ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος δοκεῖ κατὰ τὴν συνήθειαν . . . λέγεσθαι κτλ.

219 The same image with another application is used by Clement of Alexandria; see above, p. 232.

220 Cf. Paul, Eph 2:19–21: “citizens with the saints and also members of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as the cornerstone. In Him the whole structure is joined together and grows into a holy temple in the Lord.” See J. Jeremias, ἀκρωγωνιαῖος, in: Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. I, pp. 792–793.

Origen then rounds off his discussion of the names in Rev 22:13 by saying that by relating one expression to different forms of reasonable beings (εἰδὴ τῶν λογικῶν) and the other to various aspects of the work of the Son of God, one has a difference between the two terms as also with the phrase “Alpha and Omega”.

For our study it is important that the combination “beginning and end” in Origen suggests the idea of totality, so that in his exegesis he can suddenly jump to the saying “all in all” from 1 Cor 15:28 (where by the way it refers to God, not Christ!).

We can see that this explanation is kept strictly Christological and given in the context of other texts on the person and work of Christ. It should be stressed again how Origen keeps the terms entirely within the biblical framework. He is dependent on the Apocalypse and does not offer any new perspectives that would illuminate the subject of this article, except perhaps the negative point that apparently in the circles in which he moved and which he knew from writings, the expression “Beginning and End” was not current as an independent divine predicate, as it is in Josephus and the Apocalypse.

Patristica



Studies on the So-Called First Epistle of Clement.

The Literary Genre

Introduction

More than forty years ago, in July, 1929, in the serene peace, suitable to university activity, a simple ceremony took place in Berlin: a professor concluded his seminar in church history, after an address by the senior student. For us, who after four decades (how much has happened!), look back at this event, it acquires special dramatic and symbolic significance because of the persons of the two principal figures. The senior student was Dietrich Bonhoeffer and the name of the professor was Adolf von Harnack. The first had before him a future of resistance against the Nazis; he would die as a martyr on the 9th of April, 1945, in Flossenburg prison, but eventually exercised a profound and far-reaching influence on the theological development of the world of the 50's and 60's through his book with the title *Widerstand und Ergebung* ["Resistance and Surrender"].¹ Von Harnack, the magisterial church historian, the universal scholar, who was the head of the "Preussische Statsbibliothek" [Prussian Library] and who designed and led the "Wilhelms Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaften" [Wilhelm's Society for the Advancement of the Sciences], brought his work to a close: one of the most brilliant figures among the many great scholars with which Germany between 1870 and 1930 was so rich.² For a full 54 years, von Harnack had led his seminar, and in the process had formed a great multitude of excellent church historians. In 1929, he placed an exclamation mark after his life-long activities:³ he did this in a manner that was characteristic of him, that is, by a farewell address in the form of a book with the title "Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte. Das Schreiben der römischen Kirche an die Korinthische aus der Zeit Domitians (I. Clemensbrief)" [*Introduction to*

1 E. Bethge, *Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Theologe, Christ, Zeitgenosse* (München, 1967).

2 A. (von) Harnack (May 7, 1851–June 10, 1930); see on him: W. Schneemelcher, "Harnack, Adolf," in: *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*³ (Tübingen, 1959) Vol. III, col. 77–79, and above all the biography of Agnes von Zahn-Harnack, *Adolf von Harnack*² (Berlin, 1951).

3 On the conclusion of Harnack's "Seminar", see the comments of A. von Zahn-Harnack, *Adolf von Harnack*,² 436. On the relation of Bonhoeffer to von Harnack, see E. Bethge, *Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, 95ff., 175f.

Early Church History. The Writing of the Roman Church to the Corinthian Church from the Time of Domitian (The First Epistle of Clement)].⁴

This writing of 128 pages is neither in size nor in content anything especially striking in the extensive corpus of works of the master. Nevertheless, one can without fear of contradiction name this work his “intellectual testament”. And the evidence for this is not so much that von Harnack occupied himself with the so-called First Epistle of Clement from the beginning of his scholarly activity to the end,⁵ nor is it that—looking towards the future—he enumerated in his last book a long series of topics from this epistle which had not received sufficient attention,⁶ but above all because this writing clearly brought to expression what was essential for Harnack in the whole of his studies. Church history stood at the center of his wide-ranging activity, and for von Harnack that meant the history of Christianity in the period of its origin in the ancient world. It was his firm conviction that, when one had a good understanding of this period, subsequent church history was an open book.⁷

4 A. von Harnack, *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte. Das Schreiben der römischen Kirche aus der Zeit Domitians (I. Clemensbrief)* (Leipzig, 1929). See the foreword, p. 3, where he says, among other things, that the seminar “had stood at the center of my academic work”; on this point, compare his: “Ansprachen in der Festsitzung des Kirchenhistorischen Seminars zum Feier des sechzigsten Geburtstages (1911),” in *Aus der Werkstatt des Vollendeten* (Giessen, 1930) 7–15.

5 In 1876, he published with O. von Gebhardt a critical edition with commentary in *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, Vol. I (Lipsiae, 1876). In 1909, he dealt with this epistle again in “Der erste Klemensbrief, eine Studie zur Bestimmung des Charakters des ältesten Heidenchristentums,” *Sitzungsberichte der königlichen preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Klasse (Berlin, 1909) 38–63. E. Bethge, *Bonhoeffer*, 96, passes on the “complaint” of Bonhoeffer to one of his fellow-students: “Über die Clemensbriefe kommt Harnack nicht hinaus! Wenn er doch auch einmal über die Reformation ein Seminar halten wollte” (“Harnack can’t seem to get beyond the epistles of Clement! If he would only once offer a seminar on the Reformation.”).

6 A. von Harnack, *Einführung*, 99–102. On p. 5, one reads: “Weder die Römische Kirche . . . noch die evangelischen Kirchen noch die historisch-theologische Wissenschaft würdigen in Untersuchung und Unterricht das Schreiben so, wie es sich gebührt.” (“Neither the Roman Catholic Church . . . nor the Protestant churches, nor historical-theological scholarship give this writing its proper due in research and teaching”).

7 Cf. A. von Harnack, “Über den sogenannten ‘*Consensus quinque-saecularis*’ (1925) in *Aus der Werkstatt*, 81: “Gerade aber die genaue Kenntnis der Kirchengeschichte der fünf ersten Jahrhunderte ist hier so wichtig; denn wer den Geist des Katholizismus begriffen hat in seiner Christlichkeit einerseits und in seiner Abhängigkeit von der griechisch-römischen Kultur andererseits, der hat damit auch die Notwendigkeit der Reformation und das Werden und der Wert der Konfessionen überhaupt begriffen” (“But precisely an exact knowledge of church history in the first five centuries is so important here; for whoever has

The access to this period par excellence was provided, in von Harnack's view, by the above-named epistle, an opinion which von Harnack justified in the following terms:

im I. Clemensbrief stellt sich die älteste Kirche aus den Heiden nach Geist und Wesen selbst dar, und man kann durch eine unschwere Analyse sowohl ihre Elemente feststellen als auch ihre weitere Entwicklung zur katholischen Kirche voraussehen. (In the First Epistle of Clement the earliest church composed of Gentiles presents itself in terms of its spirit and essence, and without a difficult analysis one can not only identify its basic elements, but also foresee its subsequent development into the Catholic church.)

Accordingly, von Harnack's book begins with the words:

da es keine zweite Urkunde gibt, die mit ihm in Hinsicht der geschichtlichen Bedeutung zu rivalisieren vermag (since there is no other document which is able to rival it [I Clement] in respect to historical significance).⁸

These words, the conclusion of a long and fruitful life of study devoted to the history of the ancient church, put the great significance of this epistle in a clear light.⁹ And though a number of new developments have taken place in this area over the past 40 years, and though one can now speak somewhat more exactly on certain matters than von Harnack did, no one would wish to dispute the fact that this writing, I Clement, is of extraordinary importance.¹⁰

The name "First Epistle of Clement" designates a very substantial letter—in the current arrangement it is divided into 65 chapters—sent by the Christian

comprehended the spirit of Catholicism, in its essential Christianity on the one hand, and in its dependence on Greco-Roman culture on the other hand, has thereby also understood the necessity of the Reformation and the origin and value of the confessions").

8 A. von Harnack, *Einführung*, 5–6.

9 I should also wish to call to mind that in 1969 it was exactly a century ago that the great English scholar of the New Testament and Patristics, J.B. Lightfoot (1828–1889) published the first edition of his commentary on 1 Clement, the beginning of what in the 2nd edition grew into his monumental and enduring classic, *The Apostolic Fathers* (London, 1889–1890), 5 vols.

10 An overview of research after 1929 is provided by K. Beyschlag, *Clemens Romanus und der Fröhenkatholizismus* (Tübingen, 1966) 1–47.

community of Rome in 96 A.D.¹¹ to the community at Corinth. This is, therefore, the earliest Christian writing which was not taken up into the canon of the New Testament, although it was highly regarded in the early church,¹² and was itself in a few instances reckoned among the books of the New Testament.¹³ Contemporary with later books of the New Testament, such as the "Apocalypse of John," it originated in a period from which precious few sources have been preserved. Its value is enhanced by the fact that it derived from the Christian community of Rome, where once the apostles Peter and Paul had worked and, a generation earlier, had died;¹⁴ its dogmatic and ethical views give us insight into the understanding of Christian faith that was current in this increasingly influential community in the course of the following centuries. Above all, this writing is of great importance in respect to the question of which traditions are preserved here, whether there is a profound change in comparison with Paul.¹⁵ And since this letter, as still remains to be seen, is concerned with a conflict in regard to church order, it is of inestimable value for insight into the development of ecclesiastical organization in early Christianity, a matter of such great "consequence," but in its origins still so full of riddles. Both for the

11 No date is mentioned in the writing itself, but it is generally assumed that the words of apology in the prologue (1:1, διὰ τὰς αἰφνιδίους καὶ ἐπαλλήλους γενομένας ἡμῖν συμφορὰς καὶ περιπτώσεις) make reference to the persecution under the emperor Domitian. The author looks back on the time of the apostles (44:3; 47:1ff.), yet he also speaks of Peter and Paul as belonging to his own generation (5:1). In the present state of research, there is unanimity regarding this date.

12 See the overview in R.M. Grant and H.H. Graham, *The Apostolic Fathers*, Vol. 2: *First and Second Clement* (New York, 1965) 5–8. The testimonia are fully assembled and printed in J.B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*,² Vol. II, 149–200.

13 This is the case in the so-called Codex Alexandrinus (A). In one Syriac manuscript the text is divided into pericopae so as to be read on particular Sundays. As appears from the testimony of Dionysius bishop of Corinth (in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* IV.23.9–10) ca. 170 A.D., the epistle was regularly read in the worship service of the community and Dionysius terms this "an ancient custom".

14 There is at present practically no doubt about the martyrdom of Paul and Peter at Rome; for our purposes, it is unnecessary to deal with this matter.

15 Thus Ernst Käsemann writes in his recently published book *Paulinische Perspektive* (Tübingen, 1969) 165: "Paul does not yet use the Old Testament like I Clement as a book of illustrations and examples. For he was not interested in the formation of church morals and divine paideia as education in Christian character." ("Paulus hat das Alte Testament noch nicht wie der I. Clem. als Bilderbuch und Beispielsammlung benutzt. Denn er war nicht an der Bildung einer kirchlichen Moral und an der göttlichen Paideia als eine Erziehung zum christlichen Charakter interessiert.") I offer this citation merely as an illustration of the distance which one sometimes sees between Paul and I Clement; it is not possible in this context to enter into the question of this aspect of I Clement in any detail.

first phase of the “hellenization of Christianity,” as well as for the emergence of what is sometimes called Early Catholicism, this letter is a crowning witness. In the attempt to answer the multitude of questions with which the appearance of early Christianity in the ancient world confronts us, one always turns with justification to this document. The evaluation of its evidence has powerful repercussions for the picture that one forms of the course of development. Therefore, it is important for the New Testament scholar and the church historian to make an accurate evaluation.

It has already been observed, with reference to the prescript, that it is the *ekklesia* of Rome which writes, a collective, that always uses the first person plural in referring to itself. The name of the writer—for the unity of style that characterizes the letter as a whole obliges one to think of a single author—is not mentioned. On the basis of a statement in a letter of Dionysius bishop of Corinth (ca. 170 A.D.), which speaks of “the letter that was formerly sent to us through Clement”¹⁶ (by which, one generally assumes, this letter is meant), it has become customary, as in some of the later manuscripts, to see in this Clement the author, and for the sake of brevity to speak of “Clement.”¹⁷ As there is no real objection against this, we will for convenience sake adopt the accustomed usage. But one should bear in mind that Clement’s function can hardly have been more than that of a secretary, and one must guard against a powerful tendency which on more than one occasion in the past has drawn unwarranted inferences from the mention of a personal name (the writer is thereby promoted from secretary to pope!).¹⁸

With respect to the question of what situation existed in the community of Rome such that a detailed writing of this kind should be sent to fellow-Christians in Corinth, the answer is plain, since the letter speaks about it in various places:¹⁹

16 Dionysius of Corinth, in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* IV.23.10. With this one usually combines the observation of Hermas, *Vis.* II.4.3: πέμψει οὖν Κλήμης εἰς τὰς ἑξὼ πόλεις, ἐκεῖνῳ γὰρ ἐπιτέτραπται.

17 In some manuscripts and in most editions of the so-called Apostolic Fathers this letter is connected with another writing, a sermon, which was probably produced much later, under the name of “Second Clement”. It is for this reason that one speaks of our writing as “First Clement”. Cf. B. Altaner and A. Stuiber, *Patrologie*⁷ (Freiburg i. Br., 1966) 47, 88.

18 Whenever the “authority” of this letter, that is to say, its oversight of Corinth is mentioned, or whenever Clement is spoken of as “bishop of Rome” as a consequence of early bishops-lists (his place in the succession varies), this suggestion is at work, perhaps often unnoticed.

19 The text of I Clement is cited according to the most recent edition of J.A. Fischer, *Die apostolischen Väter*³ (Darmstadt, 1959).

1:1:

Owing to the sudden and repeated misfortunes and calamities which have befallen us, we consider that our attention has been somewhat delayed in turning to the questions disputed among you, beloved, and especially the abominable unholy sedition, alien and foreign to the elect of God, which a few rash and self-willed persons have made blaze up to such a frenzy that your name, venerable and famous, and worthy as it is of all man's love, has been much slandered. (Διὰ τὰς αἰφνιδίους καὶ ἐπαλλήλους γενομένας ἡμῖν συμφορὰς καὶ περιπτώσεις βράδιον νομίζομεν ἐπιστροφὴν πεποιήσθαι περὶ τῶν ἐπιζητούμενων παρ' ὑμῖν πραγμάτων, ἀγαπητοί τῆς τε ἀλλοτρίας καὶ ξένης τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ μιᾶς καὶ ἀνοσίῳ στάσεως, ἣν ὀλίγα πρόσωπα προπετὴ καὶ αὐθάδῃ ὑπάρχοντα εἰς τοσοῦτον ἀπνοοίας ἐξέκαυσαν, ὥστε τὸ σεμνὸν καὶ περιβόητον καὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἀξιαγάπητον ὄνομα ὑμῶν μεγάλως βλασφημηθῆναι.)

44:6:

For we see that in spite of their good service you have removed some from the ministry which they fulfilled blamelessly. (ὁρῶμεν γὰρ ὅτι ἐνίοις ὑμεῖς μετηγάγετε καλῶς πολιτευομένους ἐκ τῆς ἀμέμπτως αὐτοῖς τετιμημένης λειτουργίας.)

47:6:

To hear that on account of one or two persons the steadfast and ancient church of the Corinthians is being disloyal to the presbyters. (ἀκούεσθαι τὴν βεβαιωτάτην καὶ ἀρχαίαν Κορινθίων ἐκκλησίαν δι' ἐν ἣ δύο πρόσωπα στασιάζειν πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους.)

63: 2-4:

For you will give us joy and gladness, if you are obedient to the things which have been written through the Holy Spirit, and root out the wicked passion of your jealousy...and quickly attain to peace. (Χαράν γὰρ καὶ ἀγαλλίασιν ἡμῖν παρέξετε ἐὰν ὑπήκοοι γενόμενοι τοῖς ὑφ' ἡμῶν γεγραμμένοις διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐκκόψῃτε τὴν ἀθέμιτον τοῦ ζήλους ὑμῶν ὀργήν... εἰς τὸ ἐν τάχει ὑμᾶς εἰρηνεῦσαι.)

65:1:

Rome hopes that the three emissaries whom they sent to Corinth will be speedily sent back in order that they may report the sooner the peace and concord which we pray for and desire. (ὅπως θάπτον τὴν εὐκταίαν καὶ ἐπιποθήτην εἰρήνην καὶ ὁμόνοιαν ἀπαγγέλλωσιν.)

It is thus clear that there have been troubles in Corinth, because a few presbyters have been removed from their "office," in Rome's view, unjustly. This

conflict between Christians has given rise to a public report, and they have put themselves in danger.²⁰ The church at Rome now seeks through this writing, which is transmitted by three apparently prominent members of the community, to restore the peace, which means that the presbyters must be restored to their office and that the mischief-makers must desist from their actions.

In how far this mission was a success is unknown to us. We only know that more than a half-century later, the letter was still being regularly read in the church at Corinth, and that it was even then an old custom.²¹ One may well imagine that the substance of the letter was genuinely appreciated; and that perhaps frequent reading was not a superfluous luxury.

These are all well known facts, "plain facts," about which there is no difference of opinion. But now there arise on all sides questions as to the background of the problems in Corinth and the reaction to it in Rome, a number of questions which, apart from partial explanations here and there, find an answer only in the form of this lengthy epistle, in the framework of the writing as a whole, and the description it gives of the state of affairs. These questions are of such importance because we are dependent upon this document alone to provide a basis of knowledge of past events, and no reports of the other party stand at our disposal.

There are, in my view, three fundamental issues to consider: 1) the composition of the letter; 2) the evaluation of the state of affairs in Corinth; 3) the nature of the intervention of Rome. Each of these points must be elucidated somewhat.

1) The question can be formulated as follows: Why does this letter deal so prolixly with a number of subjects which at first sight have nothing to do with the actual matter of concern? Knopf, who in 1899 devoted an extensive investigation to the composition,²² summarizes his conclusions in the introduction to his excellent commentary of 1920 with these words:

But beyond the immediate occasion of the writing, the Romans provide, in the most comprehensive terms, a number of admonitions on the principles of Christian life and conduct, despite the fact that it is impossible to see precisely in what connection these admonitions stand with the actual purpose of the letter. (Doch geben die Römer über die unmittelbare Veranlassung des Schreibens hinaus in umfangreicher Wortfülle

20 Cf. 47:7 καὶ αὕτη ἡ ἀκοὴ οὐ μόνον εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐχώρησεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἑτεροκλινεῖς ὑπάρχοντας ἀφ' ἡμῶν.

21 See above, n. 16.

22 R. Knopf, *Der Erste Clemensbrief* (Leipzig, 1899) 156–194.

noch eine Anzahl von Ermahnungen über die Hauptstücke christlichen Wandels und Lebens, ohne dass man genauer sehen könnte, in welchem Zusammenhang diese Mahnungen mit dem eigentlichen Zweck des Briefes stehen.)²³

In this regard he refers to the first part of the letter, chapters 4–38, and the summary in 62:1–2, which I cite here in its entirety because of its importance:

We have written enough to you, men and brethren, concerning what befits our religion and what is most particularly helpful to those who intend to lead a virtuous life in reverence and righteousness. For we have touched upon every topic—faith, repentance, genuine love, self-control, sound judgment, and patience, reminding you that we must reverently please almighty God in righteousness and truth and long-suffering, living in harmony, without malice, in love and peace, with constant forbearance as did our forefathers mentioned above who pleased him by their humble attitude toward their God and Father, the Creator, and toward all men. (περὶ μὲν τῶν ἀνηκόντων τῇ θρεσκειᾷ ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν ὠφελιμωτάτων εἰς ἐνάρετον βίον τοῖς θέλουσιν εὐσεβῶς καὶ δικαίως διευθύνειν, ἱκανῶς ἐπεστείλαμεν ὑμῖν, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, περὶ γὰρ πίστεως καὶ μετανοίας καὶ γνησίας ἀγάπης καὶ ἐγκρατείας καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ὑπομονῆς πάντα τόπον ἐψηλαφήσαμεν, ὑπομιμνήσκοντες δεῖν ὑμᾶς ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ καὶ μακροθυμίᾳ τῷ παντοκράτορι θεῷ ὅσῳς εὐαρεστεῖν ὁμονοοῦντας ἀμνησικάκως ἐν ἀγάπῃ καὶ εἰρήνῃ μετὰ ἐκτενοῦς ἐπιεικείας καθὼς καὶ οἱ προδεδηλωμένοι πατέρες ἡμῶν εὐηρέστησαν ταπεινοφρονοῦντες τὰ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα καὶ θεὸν καὶ κτίστην καὶ πάντας ἀνθρώπους.)

One wonders what all this has to do with the actual matter of concern, and finds the explanation in the character of this writing, “eine homilienartige Abhandlung” (a sermonic treatise), an edifying piece, that gives no historically reliable picture of the situation in Corinth, but expresses an ideal of Christian

23 R. Knopf, *Die apostolischen Väter I, Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel; die zwei Clemensbriefe* (Tübingen, 1920) 42; cf. also 43: “Beyond the needs of the moment, he has produced a literary work of art which transcends the form of the letter and portrays in broad, hortatory expositions and elaborations the ideal of the proper Christian way of life” (“Ueber den Augenblicksbedarf hinaus hat er ein literarisches Kunstprodukt geliefert, dass die Form des Briefes sprengt und in breiten predigtartigen Gedankengängen und Ausführungen das Ideal rechten christlichen Lebenswandels zeichnet”).

life.²⁴ Our fellow-countryman G.A. van den Bergh van Eysinga brought the same objection to expression:

In fact, however, this long sermon deals with all kinds of subjects, and only in passing with the theme: discord, which actually comes to expression only in ch. 44, and one wonders how all the preceding can have contributed to the resolution of the conflicts.²⁵

From this observation, van den Bergh van Eysinga then concludes that we do not have to do with a real letter here, but with a treatise, wherein, above all, the propriety of the subordination of the laity to the clergy is argued, the ecclesiastical office is defended against the priesthood of all believers, and peace and concord are extolled as the highest Christian virtues.

2) Is the presentation of the state of affairs, which is given here, actually reliable? One sees how Knopf addresses this question on the basis of his analysis of the composition. Van den Bergh van Eysinga saw herein a principal reason to argue that one is dealing with a fictitious work from a later period. But even those who hold fast to a date around 96 A.D. answer the question in the negative. Walter Bauer adopted Knopf's analysis without hesitation in his influential book on "Orthodoxy and Heresy in Early Christianity"; for this reason, he thought that one must be on guard in dealing with Clement:

24 R. Knopf, *Der Erste Clemensbrief* (Leipzig, 1899) 178, 186f., 193f. Similar thoughts are already expressed by W. Wrede, *Untersuchungen zum Ersten Klemensbriefe* (Göttingen, 1891), e.g., p. 2: "One often does not know whether it is his intention to say something with regard to particular situations in the sister-congregation, or merely takes the special case as a point of departure and occasion for a variety of what are often very general admonitions and instructions. Indeed, in some chapters he appears to forget completely what actually led him to write" ("Man weiss oft nicht, ist es ihm darum zu tun, etwas auf die bestimmten Zustände in der Schwestergemeinde Bezügliches zu sagen, oder nimmt er den speziellen Fall zum Ausgangspunkt und Anlass für mancherlei, oft sehr allgemeine Anweisungen und Belehrungen. Ja, in einigen Kapiteln scheint er völlig zu vergessen, was ihm eigentlich zum Schreiben veranlasste" ...); p. 5: "that much has the character of a digression, and one has the sense that the writer, often led by nothing more than accidental associations, connects one thought with another" ("... dass manches den Charakter der Abschweifung trägt, und man hat die Empfindung, dass der Schreiber öfter nur durch zufällige Assoziationen geleitet, einen Gedanken zu dem anderen reiht").

25 G.A. van den Bergh van Eysinga, *Onderzoek naar de echtheid van Clemens Eersten Brief aan de Corinthiers* (Leiden, 1908), above all, pp. 20–38, where the results are briefly summarized in his: *Oudchristelijke Geschriften* (den Haag, 1946) 171, from which the citation is taken.

An author who admittedly presents such a quantity of material for which the reader is not prepared, and who thereby—consciously or unconsciously—creates a smoke-screen over his true position, can, on the other hand—a suspicion of this kind is not easily suppressed—remain chary and incomplete in what he actually says on the issue at hand. It is precisely in the case of such a person that we have the least assurance that he reveals exhaustively and plainly his intentions and goals, especially his ultimate motives. (Ein Autor, der anerkanntermassen in solcher Umfang Dinge vorträgt, auf die man nicht gefasst ist und dadurch—bewusst oder unbewusst—seine Stellung einnebelt, kann andererseits—eine derartige Befürchtung ist nicht schlankerhand abzuweisen—in dem was er tatsächlich zur Sache sagt lückenhaft geblieben sein. Gerade bei einem solchen Menschen haben wir am wenigsten die Gewähr, dass er seine Absichten und Ziele, besonders seine letzten Beweggründe, erschöpfend und jedem deutlich enthüllt.)²⁶

On the basis of these considerations, Bauer then goes into a long discussion of the actual nature of the strife in Corinth which—consciously or unconsciously—the fictitious presentation of Clement distorts and, at the same time, reveals.

3) Why would the community of Rome, whoever the author may be, feel called upon to write this letter? There is no evidence that the initiative went out from Corinth to call for Rome's help as an arbitrator. If Rome spontaneously took this step, what brought her to this point? Consciousness of papal

26 W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, 2nd ed., G. Strecker (Tübingen, 1964) 99–100 (the first edition was that of 1934). On p. 99 he quotes Knopf (see above, p. 8 n. 23). The framing of this citation in the text is remarkable on account of the manner of argumentation: “for our part we must confirm the oft-made observation that the main part of the letter has little or nothing to do with the purpose clearly expressed by the author. That is certainly the first *perception* . . . In fact, one easily gets the *impression* that the greater portion of the letter merely serves to increase the mass, in order to raise the importance and impact of the work together with its volume” (“... müssen wir die oft gemachten Beobachtung unsererseits bestätigen, dass der Hauptteil des Briefes mit dem von ihm deutlich ausgesprochenen Zweck wenig oder nichts gemein hat. Das ist durchaus das erste *Empfinden* . . . In der Tat gewinnt man leicht den *Eindruck*, als diene die bei weitem grössere Hälfte des Briefes lediglich der Steigerung der Masse, um mit dem Umfang zugleich Gewicht und Stosskraft zu erhöhen”), (emphasis van Unnik). Also, Wrede, *Untersuchung zum Ersten Klemensbriefe*, 55: what he finds above all convincing is that the writer does not give evidence of much knowledge of the actual situation in Corinth.

power or the desire of the Christian community in the capitol of the Imperium Romanum to exercise dominion also *in religiosus*? The Roman Catholic scholar van Cauwelaert discussed and rejected both motives in 1935; according to van Cauwelaert, it was:

l'intimité de leurs relations ordinaires qui a en quelque sorte forcé les sentiments de solidarité chrétienne de l'Église de Rome à s'expliquer, dès lors que le bien de l'Église de Corinthe se trouvait en cause.²⁷

This opinion, however, has not remained uncontested, among others by B. Altaner, who, in connection with the judgment of von Harnack, thinks that it is rather unlikely that the community of Rome heard the voice of her sister congregation in an entirely uncalculating manner, which is not to say that brute power-politics was involved, but rather a latent sense of special apostolicity.²⁸ Fischer names this "the most important question in relation to our epistle," and yet his answer to the question is ambiguous. On the one hand, he says that this intervention:

surely results from a feeling of fraternal responsibility for the peace and well-being of the Corinthians. (erfolgte sicherlich aus dem Empfinden brüderlicher Mitverantwortung für den Frieden und das Heil der Korinther.)

But later he concludes in reference to 59:1:

Nevertheless what presents itself here is not merely a typical *correctio fraterna*. (Dennoch scheint nicht nur eine gewöhnliche *correctio fraterna* vorzuliegen.)

27 R. van Cauwelaert, "L'intervention de l'Église de Rome à Corinthe vers l'an 96," *Revue de l'Histoire Ecclesiastique* 31 (1935) 305 (the article comprises pages 267–300). See on this question the overview by K. Beyschlag, *Clemens Romanus und der Frühkatholizismus* (Tübingen, 1966) 6ff., with consideration of the significant question: What gave Rome the occasion "so doch mit grösstem Nachdrucke in Korinth das Wort, um nicht zu sagen das Kommando zu ergreifen".

28 A. von Harnack, *Einführung*, 98–99, and B. Altaner, "Der I. Clemensbrief und das römische Primat" in *Kleine patristische Schriften* (Berlin, 1967) 539 (the article, pp. 534–39, appeared originally in *Theologische Revue* 25 [1936] 41–45).

And in 63:2 ff, he hears a tone of authority. Typical of his treatment of the subject is the concluding observation:

To be sure, a position of Roman primacy is nowhere expressly asserted; and yet there is also no passage which expressly contradicts it. (Freilich ist noch nirgend eine primatiale Stellung Roms ausdrücklich behauptet; es findet sich aber auch keine Stelle, die ihr widerspräche.)²⁹

The question is therefore this: is a power-position of the Roman church already visible here at the end of the first century, which in the course of time was to prove so strongly determinative for church history? The answer to this question is naturally of great importance for the whole view that one forms of the earliest period of development.

In the attempt to elucidate these questions, it becomes clear that the answer cannot pertain to the events of the year 96 alone, but rather has far-reaching implications. But at the same time, it should be apparent that much, if not everything, here depends upon the point of departure, upon the judgment that one forms regarding the purpose and intention of this letter.

Now it is truly a striking fact that the author in ch. 1 mentions the immediate cause of his letter merely in passing, and comes to speak of it in reality only in ch. 44ff. One cannot escape this difficulty by simply explaining that the author's intention was nevertheless good.³⁰ This fact must be explained in one way or another, preferably on the basis of evidence provided by the author himself. Knopf thinks that he sees here a shift of emphasis, so that discussion of difficult matters is placed after a depiction of the ideal state of the Christian life. Fischer speaks of:

The expanded purpose (den erweiterten Zweck) of the work, for in general the construction of the letter is such that from the beginning it was not only intended for a single purpose, but for repeated reading in the worship service. (im ganzen ist der Aufbau des Briefes so, dass er von Anfang an nicht nur für seinem einmaligen Zweck, sondern überhaupt zur Verlesung im Gottesdienst bestimmt war); thus there is an identifiable disposition, but it is not strict (straff).³¹

29 Fischer, *Die apostolischen Väter*, 11f.

30 So, for example, A. von Harnack, *Einführung*, 52 and Fischer, *Die apostolischen Väter*, 6.

31 Thus, Fischer, *Die apostolischen Väter*, 6; cf. Also p. 8: "The inclination of the letter is, in the first instance, an ethical-disciplinary one. It aims at the restoration of peace and concord, the renewal of Christian custom and ecclesiastical discipline, the divinely-willed order,

One asks oneself how this scholar knows that the letter was meant to be read in the church; but even if one accepts this notion, the question remains of how it was connected with the situation and the sensational crisis. If the writer wished to have an effect, then the connection must be made clear in one way or another; it is hardly sufficient to assemble a handful of arbitrarily chosen fragments of sermons as packaging for a theory of church law, embellished with rhetorical trimmings. Or must one assume with Bauer that the lengthy introductory portion of the letter is actually a smokescreen behind which the true, indeed rather obscure, intention of Clement is hidden?

It is striking how often in Bauer's interpretation he speaks of his "feeling" (Empfinden), "impression" (Eindruck), and "suspicion" (Befürchtigung), merely subjective expressions which, however respectable they may seem, are nevertheless highly questionable when one is seeking the intention of the original author. Such impressions are naturally important, but cannot be allowed to tip the scale of judgment. Bauer formulates the criterion that I Clement contains so many expositions "for which one is not prepared" (auf die man nicht gefasst ist); but then the question arises, who this "one" actually is: the scholar in Germany of the 20th century or the man in Corinth of the 1st century? It is virtually certain that with "one" is meant "I, Bauer". But can one be so certain that what seems strange to us in a document from antiquity would have also seemed so to an inhabitant of the Imperium Romanum? When van den Bergh van Eysinga said, "We do not understand . . ." (see his *Onderzoek*, p. 35), then one can ask: What is the basis of our lack of understanding? Instead of immediately ascribing all kinds of obscure motives to the Roman writer on the basis of what one does not comprehend, one might begin to ask oneself whether it might not be possible that whenever one is dealing with conceptions that were current in antiquity, the matter may appear in a very different light. One might first attempt to comprehend this letter with the eye and ear of the ancient reader. In any case, it is best not to allow one's own ideas and opinions to have free play, but to attempt to discover how the author himself characterized his

in the formerly high-standing community of Corinth. To this disciplined harmony, those who were complicit in the uprising should humbly return, while the instigators of the unrest should penitently depart from the community" (Das Anliegen des Briefes ist in erster Linie ein ethisch-disziplinäres. Es geht um die Wiederherstellung von Frieden und Eintracht, um die Erneuerung christlicher Sitte und kirchlicher Zucht, das gottgewollte Tagma, in der vordem hochstehenden Gemeinde von Korinth. Zu dieser disziplinierten Harmonie sollen die Mitläufer des Aufruhrs demütig sich zurückfinden, während die Aufrührer bussfertig auswandern sollen.).

work. Apart from the summary of the subject matter in 62:1f. (see above), the author has expressed himself clearly in two additional places.

Thus our study shall take its point of departure from the question articulated above. Accordingly, the subject of the *literary genre of this letter* is the first to be considered. When this has been established, then we shall ask, on the basis of the message of the author of a work on “peace and concord,” and in *the context of the ancient concept of the subject*, what light is thrown on the structure and *composition of the letter*? Thereby, hopefully, a better image of *the events* in Corinth can be obtained.

The Literary Genre of I Clement

The importance of the “form critical” investigation of early Christian literature has been greatly elevated in the last decades, above all in Germany. It is striking that in this research no attention has been paid to the *Prima Clementis*. This fact is even more remarkable, since, as will be demonstrated by what follows, in this case we need not have recourse to purely hypothetical forms invented or contrived by ourselves “pour besoin de la cause,” but here we have before us a specimen of a clearly demonstrable *ancient* form.

It is obviously a truism to say that this is a letter; the opening and the closing words permit not the least doubt on this point. But at the same time, this letter displays many of the characteristics of a treatise. Is this a letter or a treatise in letter-form? To adopt Deissman’s terminology, is this a “letter” or an “epistle”?³²

Twice the author gives ancient readers a clear indication of what he is aiming at. In 58:2 he says: “Receive our counsel, and there shall be nothing for you to regret” (δέξασθε τὴν συμβουλὴν ἡμῶν καὶ ἔσται ἀμεταμέλητα ὑμῖν), which is confirmed in a remarkable manner by an oath-formula. As is clear from the context, the word συμβουλή is not simply advice (we shall return to this point later), but refers to the letter as a whole. Next, one might mention above all the text in 63:2:

For you will give us joy and gladness, if you are obedient to the things which we have written through the Holy Spirit, and root out the wicked passion of your jealousy according to the entreaty for peace and concord which we have made in this letter. (χαρὰν γὰρ καὶ ἀγαλλίασιν ἡμῖν παρέξετε, ἐὰν ὑπήκοοι γενόμενοι τοῖς ὑφ’ ἡμῶν γεγραμμένοις διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου

32 A. Deissmann, *Licht von Osten*, 4th ed. (Tübingen, 1923) 196ff.

πνεύματος ἐκκόψητε τὴν ἀθέμιτον τοῦ ζήλους ὑμῶν ὁργὴν κατὰ τὴν ἔντευξιν, ἣν ἐποιήσάμεθα περὶ εἰρήνης καὶ ὁμονοίας ἐν τῇδε τῇ ἐπιστολῇ.)

Here it is clearly demonstrated that the author intends to “make a clean sweep,” so to speak, in Corinth by means of the ἔντευξις on “peace and concord” which is given in this letter from Rome.

In research on this letter up to the present, so it appears from the commentaries, little or no consideration has been given to the evidence provided by the author himself, let alone to derive from it suitable conclusions, apt to generate a proper understanding of this document.³³ Whether a certain theological “timidity” is at work here, I do not venture to say. In any case, it is clear that, with a few rare exceptions, the letter has been considered almost exclusively with an eye on developments *within* the Christian church, and that there has been no satisfactory reckoning with the cultural “context” of the author. Clement has been viewed as a Christian, but not sufficiently as a Christian *in antiquity*.³⁴

For reasons that will become clear later, it is necessary to begin with a discussion of 63:2.

‘Eirene kai homonoia in I Clement’

The combination of the two words εἰρήνη and ὁμονοία in 63:2 is not an ad-hoc formulation, as we have suggested in the foregoing section, but in fact expresses the goal of the letter. Surely, this writing would have been brought to Corinth by trusted men, who have been sent by Rome (63.3), and the hope

33 In most cases there is no explicit discussion of this matter. As already noted, it is mentioned by Harnack, *Einführung*, 121, and Fischer, *Die apostolischen Väter*, 3, in such a way that the importance of the subject is minimized.

34 The recent book by K. Beyschlag is a clear example of this tendency: with admirable zeal all the material from Christian (ultimately Jewish) sources is assembled, although the author often disregards chronological order, but the “pagan” sources are systematically left out of account, even in his discussion of *stasis*, upon which everything depends; as a result, this work leads to incorrect conclusions (see the detailed review by H.G. Leder in *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 92 [1967] 831–35). This is an example of what one finds in many studies of I Clement: one refers the letter to itself, compares it to other Christian writings, such as the Pauline epistles, or at most with Stoic philosophy on particular points, instead of making it clear that the whole “context” must be taken into account, as I hope to do in what follows.

is expressed that these men will be able to return to Rome speedily³⁵ to bring a report of the good outcome of their mission: ὅπως θάττον τὴν εὐκταίαν καὶ ἐπιποθήτην ἡμῖν εἰρήνην καὶ ὁμόνοιαν ἀπαγγέλωσιν (65:1). The two adjectives used here say as much as the pronoun ἡμῖν to which they are added: when the emissaries return with this message, the goal of the letter is attained, the goal which the community of Rome so fervently desired, that is “peace and concord” in Corinth. We may call attention here to a small grammatical detail: the article and both adjectives stand in the singular and are not repeated in one or the other form before ὁμόνοια: this indicates clearly how fully the two terms “peace and concord” were felt to be a unity.

The restoration of good relations gives joy both to the returning emissaries and to the Christian community in Rome. The words are spoken with emphasis: μετὰ χαρᾶς and εἰς τὸ τάχιον καὶ ἡμᾶς χαρῆναι περὶ τῆς εὐσταθείας ὑμῶν. In 63:2, as well, joy is spoken of with emphasis, the joy which the Corinthian community will give to the church in Rome by concrete application of the instructions given in this letter. Here it is stated more explicitly how the “good order” (65:1, εὐσταθεία) can be achieved, that is, through rooting-out the godless passion of their jealousy; and this can only happen if they are obedient to the contents of the letter from Rome. What is striking in this passage is the negative character of what, in fact, must take place: when an end has been made to the mutual quarrel, then the affair seems to be in order. But above all it is noteworthy that the author does not think it suffices to say: ὑπήκοοι γενόμενοι τοῖς ὑφ’ ἡμῶν γεγραμμένοις διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, but also adds once again: κατὰ τὴν ἔντευξιν, ἣν ἐποίησάμεθα περὶ εἰρήνης καὶ ὁμόνοιας.³⁶ In this emphatic recapitulation is thus underscored what is comprehended in this letter. By divine inspiration Clement has not given at random some admonitions and quotations from biblical texts, but he characterizes his writing more precisely under the specific title “On peace and concord”. In this way the content is not only made more precise, but the manner by which the “rooting out” might be accomplished is also indicated.

35 It is striking that this thought is expressed three times in a single sentence: 65:1, ἐν τάχει ἀναπέμψατε . . . , ὅπως θάττον . . . ἀπαγγέλλωσιν, . . . εἰς τὸ τάχιον ἡμᾶς χαρῆναι: cf. also 48:1, ἐξάρωμεν οὖν τοῦτο ἐν τάχει (later I shall mention some noteworthy parallels; see notes 133 and 144 below).

36 The meaning and translation of the polyvalent term ἔντευξις we may leave aside for the moment. The general sense of the sentence is not dependent on the explication of this term, but is clear in itself. Only when we have the purpose of I Clement clearly in mind shall it be possible to give a more precise meaning to ἔντευξις. Thus we shall return to this question at the end of our investigation of the literary genre; see below, pp. 304–05.

It was not, however, the concrete situation, or the goal of providing a solution to the difficulties, which first provided an occasion for this formulation. In the famous, long prayer that is found in the concluding section (59:2–61:3),³⁷ twice encounter the same formula. The first text reads as follows:

Give concord and peace to us and to all who dwell on the earth, as you gave to our fathers. (Δὸς ὁμόνοιαν καὶ εἰρήνην ἡμῖν τε καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν τὴν γῆν, καθὼς ἔδωκας τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν, 60:4.)

This petitionary prayer in its entirety shows, as Knopf has clearly demonstrated in his commentary, a strong resemblance to Jewish synagogue prayers. In the present instance, the expression “as you gave to our fathers” possibly points in this direction, especially if the expression “our fathers” speaks not of the ancestors in general, but of the patriarchs of the Jewish people.³⁸ Since, as we shall soon observe (see the 2nd study), ὁμόνοια typically derives from the Greek sphere and only appears very sporadically in books of the Septuagint translated from Hebrew, one may assume that here we have terminology of the Jewish synagogue in the Diaspora. It is naturally also possible that this prayer was formulated in the Christian community, where one also tended to speak of the patriarchs of the Jewish people as “our fathers” (see, for example 1 Clem. 4:8; 31:2). In any case, whatever the source of the term may be, the author prays for “concord and peace” for himself and for all people of the earth. Here stand the same words as in 63:2; 65:1, but in reverse order. It is questionable whether one should attach much importance to this here: in any case it is not likely that a formula from the prayer is cited in 63:2; 65:1.

The prayer goes on to petition especially for the emperor in 61:1:³⁹ “And to them, Lord, grant health, peace, concord, firmness:” (οἷς δὸς κύριε, ὑγίειαν, εἰρήνην, ὁμόνοιαν, εὐστάθειαν.) Fischer remarks on this text that the three things for which the prayer asks are more applicable to the Empire than to the person of the emperor.⁴⁰ This is not entirely correct, since “peace and concord” never

37 This detailed prayer is of great importance for our understanding of the development of Christian worship, and thus has also received a great deal of attention. On all of the problems connected with this prayer, one should see the fascinating discussion of C.A. Bouman, *Communis Oratio* (Nijmegen, 1959).

38 That the term “our fathers” does not indicate the ancestors in general, but the patriarchs of the Jewish people, cf. Knopf, *Kommentar*, 49 and G. Schrenk in G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Stuttgart, 1954) Vol. 5, p. 975ff.

39 On this famous prayer for the authorities, see the excursus in Knopf, *Kommentar*, 146 f. and J.A. Fischer, *Die apostolischen Väter*, 103 n. 384.

40 Fischer, *Die apostolischen Väter*, 103 n. 385.

come into existence of themselves; they must be prayed for (we shall return to this point in the 2nd study); the rulers must bring about peace, etc. in the Empire in order for a happy regime to be exercised. In this connection it must be observed that Fischer's reference to Wis. Sol. 6:24 casts little light on the subject.⁴¹ Of much more importance, it seems to me, is the fact that this formula is strongly reminiscent of that which appears in various lists of officials since the third century B.C.: ἐπὶ τούτων ἦν εἰρήνη, εὐνομία, εὐετηρία, ὁμόνοια;⁴² in this way the fortunate condition of the city under consideration is brought to expression.⁴³ Here the prayer is clearly connected with established official terminology.

For Christians and non-Christians, for subjects and emperors, a prayer for peace and concord is the condition of a happy life on earth. It is striking here that twice the petition is made that God will give this gift. Such blessings do not come from the willingness of human beings, but must be given by God.

The combination of terms appears twice more, in 20:10, 11; we leave these passages unexplored here, in order to bring them up for discussion properly in the context of ch. 20 (see below, pp. 258–59).

41 Wis. Sol. 6:24: πλῆθος δὲ σοφῶν σωτηρία κόσμου καὶ βασιλεὺς φρόνιμος εὐστάθεια δήμου.

42 See, for example, the inscription from Tenos, *I.G.* XII. 5, 906. In this connection M. Rostovzeff wrote in his *Gesellschaft und Wirtschaftsgeschichte der hellenistischen Welt* (Darmstadt, 1962) Vol. 1, 160–61: "Diese Formel zeigt, dass im Denken der Zeitgenossen Krieg und Revolution als die hauptsächlichsten Erscheinungen gelten, die das normale Leben der Städte stören und Elend zur Folge haben" (This formula shows that, in the thinking of the ancients, war and revolution were regarded as the principal phenomena which disturb the normal life of the cities and which have misery as their consequence). See also H. Fuchs, *Augustin und der antike Friedensgedanke* (Berlin, 1926) 173f. with additional material, including an inscription honoring Augustus from Halicarnassus (*Inscriptions of the British Museum*, No. 894, also printed in P. Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum*²⁻³ [Tübingen, 1912] 410): εἰρηνεύουσι μὲν γὰρ γῆ καὶ θάλαττα, πόλεις δὲ ἀνθοῦσιν εὐνομία, ὁμόνοια τε καὶ εὐετηρία (on εἰρηνεύω) in I Clement, see below, pp. 144–46. Of great significance is also the evidence of Plutarch in a passage which is important for our subject in every respect, *Reipubl. ger. praecepta* 32: ὅρα γὰρ, ὅτι τῶν μεγίστων ἀγαθῶν ταῖς πόλεσιν, εἰρήνης, ἐλευθερίας, εὐετηρίας, εὐανδρίας, ὁμονοίας πρὸς μὲν εἰρήνην οὐδὲν οἱ δήμοι . . . δεόνται.

43 For εὐστάθεια = stability, see H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*⁹ (Oxford, 1940) 732 and W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*⁵ (Berlin, 1958) 646. In I Clement 65:1 this word is used for the "well-being" of the Christian community and is identical with εἰρήνη καὶ ὁμόνοια, which precedes it.

When one reads through I Clement, therefore, one sees how important the term 'homonoia' is in the letter,⁴⁴ and it can only seem strange how little attention has been paid to this term, in view of the use that the letter makes of it. Thus we shall give an overview of the passages in I Clement where ὁμόνοια and ὁμονοεῖν appear. Thereby it becomes immediately apparent that there is not merely one, lengthy passage where an exposition of the importance of "concord" is provided, but that the term constantly turns up in all kinds of places and in various contexts as a motif that is always audible.

In 9:1 the summons is sounded to be obedient to God's glorious will and to turn to his compassion, "abandoning the vain toil and strife and jealousy which leads to death" (ἀπολιπόντες τὴν ματαιοπονίαν τὴν τε ἔριν καὶ τὸ εἰς θάνατον ἄγον ζῆλος.) As an example Noah, among others, is mentioned, through whom the Master saved "the living creatures which entered in concord into the ark" (τὰ εἰσέλθόντα ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ ζῶα εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν, 9:4). This formulation is peculiar: the emphasis falls not on the salvation of Noah and his family (cf. I Peter 3:20), but on that of the animals. In other traditions on Noah, at least in those known to me, it is nowhere stated that the beasts entered the ark "in concord" (it is possible that the notion is derived from the "two by two" in Gen. 6:10 ff.). Knopf has rightly observed in this connection that this is said with a view to the discord in Corinth: "die Tiere waren einträchtig, die Menschen sind es nicht" (the animals were peaceable, the human beings are not so);⁴⁵ in 20:10, as well (see below, p. 259), the animals are presented as examples. It is not without cause that we

44 In what follows, I shall leave the word for the most part untranslated and use it in transcribed form. Rightly wrote W.W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great* (Cambridge, 1948) Vol. II, 400: "There is no word in English to translate it. It signifies far more than its Latin translation *concordia* or our 'concord'... 'Unity' might pass, but it is too vague; the English political catchword of a generation ago, a 'union of hearts', is better, but hearts are not minds; so I shall keep the Greek word *Homonoia* throughout"; *mutatis mutandis* this is also true for our language (Dutch).—On one occasion the word ὁμοφωνία is also used for this "concord", that is, in 51:2: the true Christians μάλλον δὲ ἑαυτῶν κατὰγνωσιν φέρουσιν ἢ τῆς παραδεδομένης ἡμῖν καλῶς καὶ δικαίως ὁμοφωνίας. This term is also found in the Pythagorean Ecphantus (apud Stobaeus IV 7.64) in relation to concord in the state in a clearly musical context; cf. on this point L. Delatte, *Les traités de la Royauté d'Ecphante, Diotogène et Sthénidas* (Liège-Paris, 1942) 225f. Philo, *De conf. ling.* 6 makes use of it in the sense of "likeness of language". As far as I am able to ascertain, ὁμοφωνία plays no role in Greek Literature on 'homonoia'. In my view no conclusion can be drawn from the appearance of this term in Clement except that it was known to him as a synonym for ὁμόνοια.

45 R. Knopf, *Kommentar*, 59.—The comparison of the "church" with the "ark", which later appears with such frequency, see F. Schmidtke, "Arche" in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, ed. Th. Klauser (Stuttgart, 1950) Vol. 1, col. 600, is not yet found here in I Clement.

have cited 9:1 as our point of departure, for as we shall see later, here a clear connection exists with the concept of 'homonoia', even if it is of a negative sort.

When in ch. 11 Lot is mentioned as an example of someone who on account of hospitality and piety was saved from destruction (cf. Gen. 19), to prove that God does not forsake those who hope in Him, but punishes the ἐτεροκλινείς,⁴⁶ the latter is illustrated by Lot's wife "who changed her mind and did not remain in agreement," (ἐτερογνώμονος ὑπαρχούσης καὶ οὐκ ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ), and who became a pillar of salt preserved until Clement's time, "in order to make known to all, that those who are double minded, and have doubts concerning the power of God, risk judgment," (ὅτι οἱ δίψυχοι καὶ οἱ διστάζοντες περὶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεως εἰς κρίμα) and become a warning to all generations." Knopf is completely correct in the observation that nowhere else is it said that Lot's wife had other opinions than her husband, but that Clement avails himself of this feature in connection with the conflict in Corinth. Knopf rightly refers to chapters 23–27 in relation to the final portion of this passage.⁴⁷ But in my view, the passage must be examined rather more closely in its details. It is striking how no less than four terms are used here to describe the state of mind of which Lot's wife is the symbol. No less remarkable is the fact that there is suddenly talk of "doubt"; this is not the exact opposite of "faith," which the author could have spoken of using ἀπιστοῦντες, on the analogy of *Wis. Sol.* 10:7. No, the word for "doubt" must have been chosen deliberately and in connection with the question which comes up for discussion later. But the negative formulation "not in agreement" (οὐκ ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ) must not be overlooked; actually it can be regarded as superfluous in this context; but precisely the fact that this expression is added emphasizes what a value is placed on 'homonoia' in this context and what the fate is of those who do not live in accordance with it. From the context of ch. 11 it is also apparent that doubt in the resurrection is somehow connected with 'homonoia'.

We come now to one of the most frequently discussed chapters of our letter, that is, ch. 20. In the framework of this study it is not possible to go into all of the problems which could be raised for discussion;⁴⁸ in connection with our theme we shall later deal with one very important point. For the moment it

46 Cf. in this connection 47:7 where the term is clearly used of non-Christians; but here in ch. 11 it has a different nuance.

47 Knopf, *Kommentar*, 60f. In chs. 23–27 it is written against doubt in the resurrection of the dead and is connected with the coming of the last judgment.

48 A good summary of the most important points is offered by R.M. Grant, *The Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 2, 42ff.

is important to see that in the description of the order that is visible in the cosmos, 'homonoia' occupies a large space. The "order" is established by God, the Creator (one notices the use of words beginning with the stem *ταγ-* occurring in practically every sense). The heavens are subjected to God "in peace" (20:1); sun, moon and stars follow the path appointed for them according to His direction "in harmony without swerving at all" (*ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ δίχᾳ πάσης παρεκβάσεως*, 20:3); the earth puts forth food in abundance for men and beasts "with no dissension, and changing none of his decrees" (*μὴ διχοστατοῦσα μηδὲ ἀλλοιοῦσά τι τῶν δεδωγματοσιμένων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ*, (20:4); the seasons change, giving place to one another "in peace" (20:9); the smallest of animals conjoin "in concord and peace" (*ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ καὶ εἰρήνῃ*, 20:10).⁴⁹ The summation, the overarching theme, is then given in 20:11:

All these things did the great Creator and Master of the universe ordain to be in peace and concord. (*ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ ὁμονοίᾳ*), and to all things does He do good, and more especially to us (the Christians.)⁵⁰

The lesson that the author draws therefrom is not expressed positively, "let us therefore also live in harmony," but negatively:

Take heed, beloved, lest his many good works toward us become a judgment (*κρίμα*) on us, if we are not citizens worthy of him, and if we do not good and virtuous deeds before him in concord. (*ἀξίως αὐτοῦ πολιτευόμενοι τὰ καλὰ καὶ εὐάρεστα ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ποιῶμεν μεθ' ὁμονοίας*, 21:1.)⁵¹

Thus one sees how in this chapter "peace and concord," side by side, play a central role. Therefore the chapter is closely connected to the theme of the letter (see above, p. 128). From the manifold forms of nature one reads how God established that "peace and concord" should pervade His creation as a boon for the creatures. Thus human beings should also live in agreement with God's will in concord. But the negative formulation of the conclusion indicates that

49 Cf. on this topic J.J. Thierry, "Note sur τὰ ἐλάχιστα τῶν ζώων du chapitre xx de la 1^{re} Clementis," *Vigiliae Christianae* 14 (1960) 235–44.

50 The description of the Christians here is noteworthy: *ἡμᾶς τοὺς προσπεφυγότας τοῖς οἰκτιρμοῖς αὐτοῦ*. Cf. 9:1 and the O.T. passages where God is described as a "Refuge," e.g., Ex. 17:15, Ps. 9:9; 18:2; 46:1; 90:1.

51 This is the reading of the Greek mss. A and H, as well as the Syriac translations; in both Coptic versions one reads instead *ἐν εἰρήνῃ* (not rendered in the Latin version).

no mere instruction, but rather a warning, is given, with an eye on the situation in Corinth.⁵²

The theme appears in a very unusual way in ch. 30. The author has proposed that the Christians are “the portion of God”⁵³ and thus must live in a holy manner. This implies the renunciation of various sins, which are named in a broad summary: *φεύγοντες καταλαλίαις, μιαρὰς τε καὶ ἀνάγνους συμπλοκάς, μέθας τε καὶ νεωτερισμούς καὶ βδελυκτὰς ἐπιθυμίας, μυσεράν τε μοιχείαν καὶ βδελυκτὴν ὑπερηφανίαν*. The last-named sin is specially underlined by a citation from Proverbs 3:34.⁵⁴ In connection with this, he then continues:

Let us then join ourselves⁵⁵ to those to whom is given grace from God (according to the word of the Old Testament); let us put on concord in meekness of spirit and continence, keeping ourselves far from all gossip and evil speaking. (*ἐνδυσώμεθα τὴν ὁμόνοιαν ταπεινοφρονοῦντες, ἐγκρατευόμενοι, ἀπὸ παντὸς ψιθυρισμοῦ καὶ καταλαλιᾶς πόρρω ἑαυτοὺς ποιοῦντες*.) Not by words, but by deeds might one justify one’s Christian existence. (30:1–3)

The chapter ends with the explanation:

Forwardness and arrogance and boldness belong to those that are accursed by God, gentleness and humility and meekness are with those who are blessed by God. (*θράσος καὶ αὐθάδεια καὶ τόλμα τοῖς κατηραμένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ· ἐπιείκεια καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνη καὶ πραΰτης παρὰ τοῖς ἡυλογημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ*, 30:8.)

With this passage one may compare what is written in 35:5:

How shall this be, beloved, ...if we seek the things which are well-pleasing and acceptable to him [that is, God] (*ἐὰν ἐκζητῶμεν τὰ εὐάρεστα*

52 Cf. J.A. Fischer, *Die apostolischen Väter*, 53 n. 123: “Friede und Eintracht, also Güter, die der Gemeinde zu Korinth verlorengegangen waren” (Peace and concord, that is, values which had been lost in the community at Corinth).

53 See on this word and its Old Testament background J. Herrmann and W. Foerster, “μερίς” in G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Stuttgart, 1938) Vol. 3, 767 ff.

54 The text of Prov. 3:34 runs *κύριος ὑπερηφάνους ἀντιτάσσειται, ταπεινοὺς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν*; it is also cited in James 4:6; 1 Peter 5:5 and obviously played a large role in early Christian paraenesis.

55 Cf. on this point 15:1 and 46:1–4.

καὶ εὐπρόσδεκτα αὐτῷ)... casting away from ourselves all iniquity and wickedness, covetousness, strife, malice and fraud, gossiping and evil speaking, hatred of God, pride and arrogance, vain-glory and inhospitality. (ἀπορρίψαντες ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν πᾶσαν ἀδικίαν καὶ πονηρίαν, πλεονεξίαν, ἔρεις, κακοηθείας τε καὶ δόλους, ψιθυρισμούς τε καὶ καταλαλιάς, θεοστυγίαν, ὑπερηφανίαν τε καὶ ἀλαζονείαν, κenoδοξίαν τε καὶ ἀφιλοξενίαν.)

All this is condemned by God in the scripture in Ps. 50:16–23. The same sort of summaries are found in the so-called “vice catalogues”;⁵⁶ the latter is dependent upon the catalogue found in Paul in Rom. 1:29–32. In the “environment” of early Christianity such lists are often encountered among Jews as well as pagans. Thus one may not assume that the catalogue in Clement was specially composed with an eye on the situation in Corinth. But it is another question whether it was not found to be very useful here to restore order to the community in Corinth. With lists of this sort, one not only pays attention to the large agreements, but also to the small deviations. In any case, it is true that the author as a general rule emphasized one or the other vice, and applied this to the conflict which he wished to see settled. If one wishes, so he argues, to live in accordance with God's will, then one must break with these various forms of sin and “put on⁵⁷ concord in meekness of spirit” (the opposite of pride), whereby slander and backbiting are singled out as sins above all others. Thus ‘homonoia’ is here an essential element of the Christian way of life; it is plainly pulled forward in this sentence for emphasis; it stands out against the obscure background of sins contained in this “vice-catalogue” (one also thinks, for example, of the word νεωτερισμός = revolution in 30:1, which is closely related in Clement to the oft-used term στάσις). Above all, it is good not to lose sight of the background under the influence of the motto: “Clement recites only a well-known saying,” for, as we shall see in the second study, such vices are frequently mentioned in Greek literature as the counterparts of, and thus in connection with, ‘homonoia’. From a comparison of 30:3 with 35:5, it thus appears that ‘homonoia’ is accounted among the things which are well pleasing to God. In this way, the connection is realized with the grace which God gives; in this

56 On these “vice catalogues,” see A. Vögtle, *Die Tugend-und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament* (Münster in Westfalen, 1936); S. Wibbing, *Die Tugend-und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament* (Berlin, 1959). On its use in I Clement, cf. J.A. Fischer, *Die apostolischen Väter*, 69, n. 204.

57 On this verb in the New Testament, see A. Oepke, in Kittel-Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (1935) Vol. II, p. 319ff.

way, what it means to be “a portion of God” takes form. For the authentically Christian life, “concord” is the decisive condition.

This comes clearly to expression in divine worship, as appears from 34:7: ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συναχθέντες τῇ συνειδήσει, ὡς ἐξ ἑνὸς στόματος βοήσωμεν πρὸς αὐτὸν (God) ἐκτενῶς κτλ.⁵⁸ (Therefore we, too, must gather together with concord in our conscience and cry earnestly to him, as it were with one mouth), that is, in order to receive what God has promised (God’s reward for a life lived in accordance with his will, cf. 34:1 ff.). Fischer observes in this connection: “The schism in Corinth has led above all to a schism in the divine worship service.”⁵⁹ But this is never explicitly stated in the letter. Since the text speaks here of “concord in conscience” (ὁμόνοια τῇ συνειδήσει), it seems to me more likely that the emphasis lies on the inner disposition in which they came together as a community, but in opposition: in other words, they met in the same place, but not in one spirit. In the initial and subordinate part of the sentence, the inner attitude is described; in the principal clause, the disposition comes to expression in a unified voice (cf. “heart and mind” in Paul, Rom. 10:10).

In ch. 49 the author exalts *Agape* in a strongly rhetorical manner,⁶⁰ under the influence of Paul’s famous words in 1 Cor. 13, praising the indescribable bond of love that binds God and human beings (49:2). Therein he says, among other things, that love has nothing about it which is “haughty” (ὕπερήφανον, cf. the above citation from 30:1f.), and then he continues: ἀγάπη σχίσμα οὐκ ἔχει, ἀγάπη οὐ στασιάζει, ἀγάπη ποιεῖ ἐν ὁμονομίᾳ - - δίχᾳ ἀγάπης οὐδὲν εὐάρεστον ἐστὶν τῷ θεῷ (“love does not have schisms, love makes no sedition, love does all things in concord... without love nothing is well-pleasing to God”). Such expressions are found nowhere in Paul’s “Hymn of Love,” but nevertheless may be derived from it. Here they are very much emphasized. Throughout, the negative formulations are strengthened by the positive: “love does all things in concord.” Here, therefore, ‘homonoia’ is the form of expression of love. After the preceding chapters, in which the troubles in Corinth come to expression, and in anticipation of what follows, in which the way to a solution is indicated, this portion of the letter can only have been written with an eye on the situation in Corinth. Therefore the author also exhorts his readers:

58 I have dealt with the meaning of this text in detail in my article, “I Clement 34 and the ‘Sanctus’ VC 5 (1951) 2004–48: see also Fischer, *Die apostolischen Väter*, 69 n. 198 and R.M. Grant, *The Apostolic Fathers* I, 60–61.

59 Fischer, *Die apostolischen Väter*, 67 n. 198.

60 Cf. R. Knopf, *Kommentare*, 125f.; L. Sanders, *L’Hellénisme de Saint Clément de Rome et le Paulinisme*. *Studia Hellenistica* 2 (Louvain: Universitas Catholica Louvainiensis, 1943) 99ff.

Let us then beg and pray of his mercy that we may be found in love, without human partisanship (δίχα προσκλίσεως ἀνθρωπίνης, 50:2), for blessed are we, beloved, if we perform the commandments of God in the concord of love (ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ ἀγάπης), that through love our sins may be forgiven. (50:5 with a reference to Ps. 32:1 ff.)

The verb derived from 'homonoia' appears only once in the epistle, that is, in 62:2:

For we have reminded you that you are bound to please almighty God with holiness in righteousness and truth and long-suffering, and to live in concord, bearing no malice, in love and peace with eager gentleness. (ὁμονοοῦντας ἀμνησικακῶς ἐν ἀγάπῃ καὶ εἰρήνῃ μετ' ἐκτενοῦς ἐπεικειάς.)

The concrete form which this "being pleasing to God" must take consists in living in concord. In principle, one could easily think of other possibilities; thus it is more noteworthy that for the community of Rome this aspect comes to the fore at present, more precisely defined by the adverbial expression "without bearing malice"—the memory of what has taken place may thus cast no shadow over the unanimity (does this mean that the prior state of affairs, cf. 2:5, is once again restored?)—and by the positive description "in love and peace with eager gentleness." What is thus urged here is an unbroken, permanent spirit of solidarity, which the community in Corinth must endeavor to attain, by which the life of the community is given form. The context makes sufficiently clear that 'homonoia' is the goal of the letter.

Reviewing the texts in which 1 Clement makes use of 'homonoia', we may establish the following: 1.) a definition or detailed exposition is nowhere given; the word is introduced and dealt with as a known quantity; 2.) it is an expression for the undisturbed, harmonious relations between human beings, visible in the order of nature; 3.) this order is established by God; if one wishes to be pleasing to God and to live in accordance with his will, then one must practice concord and in this way give form to Christian love; 4.) as the "portion of the Lord," Christians are called upon to bring this mutual concord into practice, and this goal will be reached by banishing all opinions and actions which destroy good relations with others; 5.) in the concrete situation in Corinth, relations between the Christians had been destroyed, and this letter was written in order to bring about the restoration of good relations.

Alongside of 'homonoia', the term "peace" is also found in the writing, and, as we have already seen, the two terms frequently appear together in close connection. Nevertheless, there are still a number of texts in which "peace" alone

is mentioned. Hence it is also advisable to examine in what sense this word is used by 1 Clement.

Of no direct importance for our investigation is the use of the word in the *inscriptio*: “grace and peace from God almighty be multiplied to you through Jesus Christ,” since this is no more than a Christian formula for the opening of a letter.⁶¹ The term is also found in 16:5, but provides no insight into the usage of the author, because it is part of a long citation from Isa. 53 and fulfills no function of its own. Somewhat different is the case with 22:5, where the words “seek peace and pursue it” are also a quotation from the Old Testament, that is, of Ps. 34:15b, and also from part of a very extensive citation, which encompasses virtually the whole of ch. 22 (Ps. 34:12–18); but in the case of this psalm,⁶² all of the motifs that are decisive for Clement’s conception of the relationship between God and men are to be heard; so this verse of the Psalms is a summons to realize, with all energy, “peace” as the goal of life.

We come, then, to the specific use of this term in 1 Clement that is important to us, that “peace” which was already mentioned at the beginning of the letter, in order to characterize the happy state of affairs in the community at Corinth before the outbreak of the troubles, that is, in 2:2:

Thus a profound and rich peace was given to all (οὕτως εἰρήνη βαθεῖα⁶³ καὶ λιπαρὰ ἐδέδοτο πᾶσιν), and you had an insatiable desire to do good, and the Holy Spirit was poured out in abundance on you all.⁶⁴

61 On the form of Christian letters, specifically the prescript, see the exposition with literature in O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*¹² (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1965) 3 ff. and H. Conzelmann, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1969) 32 ff. The use of the term “peace” in this connection is usually, and correctly, attributed to Semitic influence.

62 This psalm is also employed in 1 Peter 3:10–12, but in a shorter form, which deviates rather noticeably from the LXX, in contrast to what is found in 1 Clement. Thus the two Christian authors do not draw from the same textual source. It is perhaps important to take note of the argument made by E.G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter* (London, 1946) 414, “that it may well have been used at a very early stage . . . in the teaching of the primitive Church, or made the basis of shorter paraenetic forms” (see also his commentary, p. 190).

63 Cf. on this expression W. Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, col. 259. In an essay in honor of the 65th birthday of Prof. D. Gerhard Delling (Halle), that will be published in *Vigiliae Christianae*, I offer a detailed discussion of this term.

64 Behind the unusual formulation πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου ἔχουσιν ἐπὶ πάντας stands, undoubtedly, a primitive Christian usage inspired by Joel 3:1: καὶ ἔκχεώ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα cited in Acts 2:17.

What is the meaning of the little world “thus” (οὕτως) here? This word is preceded by a description of all the excellent traits which distinguished the Corinthian community, for which they were known and admired: faith, piety, hospitality, knowledge; the right attitude existed toward the leading figures in the community and in the households:

You were all humble-minded and in no wise arrogant, yielding subjection rather than demanding subjection, more gladly giving than receiving (πάντες τε ἐταπεινοφρονεῖτε μηδὲν ἀλαζονευόμενοι ὑποτασσόμενοι μᾶλλον ἢ ὑποτάσσοντες, ἥδιον διδόντες ἢ λαμβάνοντες).

The words and work of Christ characterized their lives (1:2–2:1). Therefore “peace” reigned in the community, which means more than quiet alone, the absence of tensions; it is the realization of the Christian society, which Clement saw as the ideal. One petitioned God for the forgiveness of one’s own sins and for the salvation of fellow-Christians throughout the world. It also belongs to this happy state of affairs that the Christians in Corinth were “sincere and innocent, and bore no malice to one another. All sedition and all schism was abominable to you” (εἰλικρινεῖς καὶ ἀκέραιοι ἦτε καὶ ἀμνησίκακοι εἰς ἀλλήλους. πᾶσα στάσις καὶ πᾶν σχίσμα βδελυκτὸν ἦν ὑμῖν, 2:5–6). The commandments of the Lord were transmitted to them in flesh and blood.⁶⁵ But because of their prosperity, things went wrong, as expressed by a rather curious citation from the Old Testament;⁶⁶ thus the prosperity passed over into its opposite.

From this arose jealousy and envy, strife and sedition, persecution and disorder, war and captivity.⁶⁷ Thus the worthless rose up against those

65 This is expressed with the words: “written on the tables of your heart”; alongside of the reference to Prov. 7:3, which is usually given, one is also reminded of Paul, 2 Cor. 3:3, and the Old Testament reminiscence which is present there (cf. on this point the reference in E. Nestle – K. Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*²⁵ [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1963] in the margin to 2 Cor. 3:3).

66 According to the author, this happened in fulfillment of Deut. 32:15: “My beloved (that is, Israel) ate and drank and was enlarged and waxed fat and kicked.”

67 The words “war and captivity” sound strange in connection with the Christian community in Corinth. The remarks of Knopf, *Kommentar*, 48, that the terms are “übertreibend und und bildlich,” and that “die Absetzung der Amtsträger, damit ihre Herabminderung, ihre Einflusslosigkeit mag als αἰχμαλωσία erscheinen,” are not convincing. The same may be said of the observations of K. Beyschlag, *Clemens Romanus*, 135 ff. As we hope to show in the following study, Clement is here under the influence of the Greek ‘homonoia’ concept.

who were in honor, those of no reputation against the renowned, the foolish against the prudent, the young against the old (ἐκ τούτου ζήλος καὶ φθόνος, ἔρις καὶ στάσις, διωγμός καὶ ἀκαταστασία, πόλεμος καὶ αἰχμαλωσία. οὕτως ἐπηγέθησαν οἱ ἄτιμοι ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐντίμους. οἱ ἄδοξοι ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐνδόξους, οἱ ἄφρονες ἐπὶ τοὺς φρονίμους, οἱ νέοι ἐπὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους).

For this reason, “righteousness and peace” are far removed,⁶⁸ because no one holds to the commandments of God, but each acted on the lusts of his own heart (3:2–4).

This “peace” is not a static condition, which once was and has now disappeared. There are still persons in whom it is at work, cf. 15:1:

Let us cleave to those whose peacefulness is based on piety, and not to those whose wish for peace is hypocrisy. (κολληθῶμεν τοῖς μετ’ εὐσεβείας εἰρηνεύουσιν, καὶ μὴ τοῖς μεθ’ ὑποκρίσεως βουλομένοις εἰρήνην.)

After this there follow some quotations from the Old Testament on the difference between lip service and real devotion. Does the author point here, in so many words, to the leaders of the “rebellion” who appear hypocritical?⁶⁹ Or is this a general statement? Later the reference to hypocrisy does not appear again.⁷⁰ Thus one does well, in my opinion, not to read too much into these words, which are perhaps nothing more than a reference to a certain kind of behavior, rather than an accusation. The background lies in the preceding chapter:

Therefore it is right and holy,⁷¹ my brethren, for us to obey God rather than to follow those who in pride and unruliness are the instigators of an abominable jealousy . . . , such persons rush into strife and sedition (δίκαιον οὖν καὶ ὀσιον, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ὑπηκόους ἡμᾶς μάλλον γενέσθαι τῷ θεῷ ἢ τοῖς ἐν ἀλαζονείᾳ καὶ ἀκαταστασίᾳ μυσεροῦ ζήλους ἀρχηγοῖς ἐξακολουθεῖν . . . , οἵτινες ἐξακοντίζουσιν εἰς ἔριν καὶ στάσεις (4:1–2).

68 Is there a connection here with Paul’s words in Rom. 14:17?

69 This is the interpretation of Knopf, *Kommentar*, 66: “macht den Gegnern falsche, heuchlerische Friedensliebe zum Vorwurf: sie reden von Ruhe, Ordnung, Frieden in der Gemeinde, haben aber durch die angerichtete Parteilung und durch die Absetzung der Amtsträger in Wahrheit Unruhen gestiftet.”

70 Yet one does find in 30:3 a summons to associate only with those to whom grace is given in concord, and to avoid those who gossip and speak evil.

71 The familiar Greek combination of terms which describe what is right with respect to human beings and the gods.

If one follows such persons, one incurs great danger; eternal ruin is in store. Thus one finds here the same complex of contrasts with “peace” that we have already encountered in respect to ‘homonoia’ (see above, pp. 132–133, 135–136). Whoever follows these false guides, becomes a disturber of the “peace”; whoever is obedient to God, makes “peace.”

This “peace” is a goal that was already established by the Creator in the beginning; this is the author’s point in ch. 20—already discussed above (pp. 134–135)—the harmony of nature is described as an expression of “peace.” The blessings of this creation ruled by peace are for the welfare of human beings, which makes the good of this peace even more desirable. In 19:2 one reads the exhortation:

Let us hasten on to the goal of peace, which was given us from the beginning (ἐπαναδράμωμεν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς παραδεδομένον ἡμῖν τῆς εἰρήνης σκοπὸν) and let us fix our gaze on the Father and Creator of the whole world and cleave to his splendid and excellent gifts of peace. God is ἀόργητος (“free from wrath”)⁷² toward all his creatures (19:3) and in his creation everything happens with “peace,” in harmony (ch. 20 passim).

It is noteworthy that, with the exception of the above mentioned citation in 22:5, εἰρήνη does not appear in the epistle before this section. Precisely in those passages where the difficulties in Corinth are dealt with, and where one would expect to find this word, it is not to be found. It appears first in the great liturgical prayer (59:3 ff.). Some of the texts have already been discussed, namely, those in which the word occurs in connection with ‘homonoia’ (see above, pp. 253 ff.). But a few passages in which the word is named remain to be considered.

72 From the Old Testament, Clement is familiar with the concept of “the wrath of God” (see the citation in 50:4); on this concept, see the article by H. Kleinknecht – J. Fichter – E. Sjöberg – G. Stählin in Kittel-Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch* (1954) 5:382–448. Of great importance for our text is the investigation by Kleinknecht of the use of the word by Greeks and Romans (p. 384 ff.); There one also finds mention of the “wrath of the gods”; but among all philosophical schools this is condemned as unworthy of God (see p. 386, where Cicero *De Off.* 3.102 is quoted: “*hoc quidem commune est omnium philosophorum . . . numquam nec irasci deum nec nocere*”). Thus the use of the term here in Clement shows clearly the influence of the philosophical conception of God, and is not necessarily to be regarded as Stoic per se. In order to interpret Clement correctly here, it is probably necessary to take into account that he is speaking about God’s relationship to nature, but that from the point of view of human beings, wrath rightly has its place, because human beings disobeyed God’s commands.

In 60:3 God is petitioned to provide protection against all evil:

Yea, Lord, make thy face to shine upon us in peace for our good, that we may be sheltered by thy mighty hand, and delivered from all sin by thy uplifted arm, and deliver us from them that hate us wrongfully.

The formulation of this prayer consists entirely of reminiscences of Old Testament texts⁷³ and is clearly derived from a Jewish synagogue prayer. The content expresses clearly what is understood by “peace”: protection and deliverance from all distress.

The above mentioned prayer on behalf of rulers (see above, pp. 255–56) also contains the petition that God will direct their counsels:

According to that which is good and pleasing” before him,⁷⁴ that they may administer with piety in peace and gentleness the power given to them by thee, and may find mercy in thine eyes (ὅπως διέποντες ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ πραΰτητι εὐσεβῶς τὴν ὑπὸ σοῦ αὐτοῖς δεδομένην ἐξουσίαν ἴλεώ σου τυγχάνωσιν).

The association with *πραΰτης* points in the direction of a “peace-loving disposition,” and not so much the “undisturbed administration of the government,” as in 61:1.

“Peace” is also mentioned in a summary of ideals that are characteristic of authentic Christian existence (64:1). Shortly before the definitive conclusion of his letter, the author continues to express the wish that God will give all who are called after his name: “faith, fear, peace, patience and long-suffering, self-control, purity and sobriety,⁷⁵ that they may be well-pleasing to his name.” Here “peace” is not so much an undisturbed relationship with human beings as a right relationship with God, as is apparent from the context in which the word stands. For each of these words one could probably find a parallel in a

73 Cf. Knopf, *Kommentar*, 145 and Fischer, *Die apostolischen Väter*, 103 n. 378–380. In the Old Testament and the New Testament one frequently encounters the phrase “in peace.” Cf. also the prayer *Shemoneh Esre* in the Babylonian recension: “Praised are you, O Lord, who blesses your people Israel in peace.” See G. von Rad – W. Foerster in *Kittel-Friedrich, Theologisches Wörterbuch* (1935) 2.398–418.

74 Cf. Deut. 12:25, 28; 13:19; 21:9. That which is *εὐάρεστον* (“pleasing”) to God plays a large role in this letter; it is to be found in a number of the texts discussed in the preceding pages. We shall return to this subject later.

75 Cf. on this point 62:2, cited above, p. 122. On similar lists in the New Testament, see the works mentioned in n. 56 above.

passage that would serve as an elucidation, but this is more in the nature of a general summary of the characteristic of the Christian life than a list drawn up with an eye on the situation in Corinth. Indeed this general account, with its various aspects, should be sent to the brothers in Corinth in their concrete situation!

Yet once more εἰρήνη is used in connection with the request for the return of the representatives of the community in Rome: “send them back quickly to us in peace with gladness” (65:1). Fischer refers here to Paul’s words in 1 Cor. 16:11, where it is not possible to separate the expression “in peace” from the preceding words ἀφόβως and “let no one despise him.”⁷⁶ Here in 1 Clement it is clearly stated that the representatives should return to Rome in peace and with gladness, because their mission has been accomplished, and above all peace has been restored in Corinth (cf. 2:2, see above, p. 264), so that the community there can send back the emissaries with the joyful report of the restored unity.

The verb “to live in peace” appears several times in addition to 15:1 (see above, p. 142). Twice it is found (56:12–13) in a long quotation from Job 5:17–26 (specifically, verses 23 and 24), which is adduced in order to demonstrate how great is the protection given to those who are chastened by God (56:16). Whenever it is mentioned, it is as a sign of God’s blessing: “for the wild beasts shall be at peace with you; then you shall know that your house shall have peace.” It is possible, within the whole train of thought of 1 Clement, that these words are cited here in order to indicate the harmonious relations in nature and the family which are so characteristic of ‘homonoia’. That the verb “to live in peace” is used here, in any case, as a description of the desired state of affairs in Corinth is indicated by the words in 54:2 and 63:4. In the first text, consideration is given to the motives that must inspire the “agitators” if they wish to bring an end to the troubles in Corinth; among other things, they must say: “let the flock of Christ live in peace with the presbyters set over it.” The second text spells out once more in concise and powerful fashion the goal of the intervention of Rome: emissaries were sent “in order that you may know that our whole care has been and is directed to your speedy attainment of peace” (ἵνα εἰδῇτε ὅτι πᾶσα ἡμῖν φροντίς καὶ γέγονεν καὶ ἔστιν εἰς τὸ ἐν τάχει ὑμᾶς εἰρηνεῦσαι).

Thus the word “peace” in 1 Clement expresses, with various nuances, the untroubled state in the relationship between different parts of God’s creation, their relationship with one another, and with God: in nature, in the Roman Empire, above all in the Christian community. For this reason it occupies a

76 Fischer, *Die apostolischen Väter*, 107 n. 403. The text of Paul in 1 Cor. 16:10–11 reads as follows: ἐὰν δὲ ἔλθῃ Τιμόθεος, βλέπετε ἵνα ἀφόβως γένηται πρὸς ὑμᾶς... μὴ τις οὖν αὐτὸν ἐξουθενήσῃ. προπέμψατε δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν εἰρήνῃ.

prominent place in Clement's thoughts, because the "profound peace" that had reigned in Corinth had been cruelly destroyed, and so he was eager to work for its restoration.

From the foregoing investigation it is apparent how central the concepts of *ὁμόνοια* and *εἰρήνη* were for the author(s) of 1 Clement. We may already conclude that it is not without good reason that the writing is spoken of as an *ἔντευξις . . . περὶ εἰρήνης καὶ ὁμονοίας*, in which it cannot be denied that 'homonoia' has a certain prominence. The confusion into which the church of Christ in Corinth has fallen through mutual strife makes it necessary to return to the healthy, harmonious relationship willed by God.

At the same time, we found evidence in the letter itself, specifically in the prayer at the beginning of final section of the letter (61:1), that the combination "peace and concord" was not made by Clement "on the spur of the moment," but already existed earlier. From the fact that the combination appears in the prayer, one may not simply conclude that it belonged to "the language of liturgical formulae." Indeed, we already encounter this combination, together with other terms, in inscriptions from the pre-Christian era, as a description of the happy state of affairs in which certain cities, at one time or another, found themselves. But it would be a mistake to conclude from this data that we have here a kind of "official language," since many examples of this combination can be adduced from ancient literature.

The Combination "*homonoia kai eirene*" in Non-Christian Texts

Out of the abundance of data there follows here a selection from which may be seen the wide dissemination of the combination "peace and concord."

It is best to begin with witnesses who are contemporaries of 1 Clement. The first is Dio Chrysostom. He says in his *Or.* 49.6 that the Italian Greeks prospered under the rule of the Pythagoreans for:

So long as these (philosophers) managed (*διδέπον*)⁷⁷ their cities, the Greeks prospered and conducted their municipal affairs with the greatest concord and peace. (*καὶ μετὰ πλείστης ὁμονοίας καὶ εἰρήνης πολιτευσαμένους.*)

77 Cf. 1 Clement 61:2: *διέποντες ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ πραΰτητι.*

Even more interesting is *Or.* 40.26:

For peace and concord have never damaged at all those who have employed them, but it would be surprising if enmity and contentiousness were not deadly and mighty evils (εἰρήνη μὲν γὰρ καὶ ὁμόνοια τοὺς χρωμένους οὐδὲν πώποτε ἔβλαψεν, ἔχθρα δὲ καὶ φιλονεικία θαυμαστὸν εἰ μὴ σφόδρα ἀνήκεστα καὶ μεγάλα).

It is interesting that “peace and concord” here take a verb in the 3rd person singular, and thus are regarded as a unity. One also encounters the combination in *Or.* 39.2, derived, just at the preceding citation, from a speech with the title “On ‘homonoia’”: urging an end to the discord, he observes:

But it is fitting that those whose city was founded by gods should maintain peace and concord and friendship toward one another. (πρέπει δὲ τοῖς ὑπὸ θεῶν οἰκισμένοις εἰρήνη καὶ ὁμόνοια καὶ φιλία πρὸς αὐτούς.)

From the same general time period come several texts in Plutarch. In *De Garrul.* 17 Plutarch gives an interpretation of a symbolic act of Heraclitus, with the words:

Thus demonstrating to them that to be satisfied with whatever they happen upon and not to want expensive things is to keep cities in peace and concord. (ἐπιδειξάμενος αὐτοῖς ὅτι τὸ τοῖς τυχοῦσιν ἀρκεῖσθαι καὶ μὴ δεῖσθαι τῶν πολυτελῶν ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ ὁμονοίᾳ διατηρεῖ τὰς πόλεις.)

In *de Alex. Fort.* 1.9 he states that the plan of Alexander’s campaign allows him to be recognized as a philosopher, because he did not campaign to obtain luxury for himself and a rich booty, “but to win for all men concord and peace and community of interests” (ἀλλὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ὁμόνοϊαν καὶ εἰρήνην καὶ κοινωνίαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους παρασκευάσαι διανοηθέντα). Of importance here is the connection that becomes visible between work on behalf of “peace and concord” and philosophy. With an eye on the long prayer at the end of 1 Clement, where “peace and concord” is prayed for several times (see above, pp. 253 ff.), it is interesting to read in *De Superstit.* 4 that the superstitious man trembles before the gentle gods:

From whom we ask wealth, welfare, peace, concord, and success in our best efforts in speech and action. (παρ’ ὧν αἰτούμεθα πλοῦτον, εὐπορίαν, εἰρήνην, ὁμόνοϊαν, ὀρθωσιν λόγων καὶ ἔργων τῶν ἀρίστων.)

Of importance is also a remark of Lucian in *Hermotimus* 22:

All the things that you find here—robbery, violence, cheating (ἀρπαζόντων καὶ βιαζομένων καὶ πλεονεκτούντων)—they say you would find none of them ventured in that city [where *arete* reigns]; no, they live together in peace and concord naturally enough (ἀλλὰ ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ ὁμονομίᾳ ξυμπολιτεύονται, μάλ' εἰκότως); for what, I suppose, in other cities produces strife and discord (στάσεις καὶ φιλονεικίας), plot and counterplot, is entirely absent.

Here the matter is closely bound up with the “city-state” and discussion of the contrasts in its life, from which the concept of “peace and concord” clearly receives its contours.

In this connection reference must be made to the lengthy discourse which Dio Cassius, *Hist. Rom.* 44.23 ff., puts into the mouth of Cicero (we shall return to this important discourse in a second volume). There Cicero says that he is convinced that:

We ought to give up our mutual enmities or jealousies . . . and return to that old-time state of peace and friendship and concord. (δεῖν ἡμᾶς τὰς μὲν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔχθρας ἢ φιλονεικίας, . . . καταλύσασθαι πρὸς δὲ δὴ τὴν παλαιὰν ἐκείνην εἰρήνην καὶ φιλίαν καὶ ὁμόνοιαν ἐπανελθεῖν) (24.3), and later he calls to memory Roman history: formerly they often quarreled (πρότερον πολλὰκις διχογνωμονησάντων τινῶν); but whenever they stopped hating one another, and lived the rest of their lives in peace and concord (καὶ ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ ὁμονοίᾳ τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ χρόνου διήγαγον), they were successful in war (25. 3–4).

In Tacitus one encounters the Latin equivalent, in *Hist.* 3.80.4: the senate sends a deputation to the armies involved in civil strife “to persuade them in the interests of the state to concord and peace” (*ut praetexto rei publicae concordiam pacemque suaderent*). A slightly different but parallel combination is found in a passage of Suetonius, *Otho* 8.1:

When Otho learned of this (namely, that the legions in Germany had sworn allegiance to Vitellius), he persuaded the senate to send a deputation, to say that an emperor had already been chosen and to counsel quiet and concord. (*Quod ut comperit, auctor senatui fuit mittendae legationis, quae doceret electum iam principem, quietem concordiamque suaderet.*)

Plutarch reports (*Otho* 15) that Otho wished to sacrifice himself on behalf of peace and concord (ὕπὲρ εἰρήνης καὶ ὁμονοίας). But one finds that the use of this formula is not restricted to the end of the first and the beginning of the second century A.D. P. Jal remarked on the subject that “de nombreux auteurs cherchent à préciser la conception de la ‘paix’ ayant recours au doublet pax-concordia”;⁷⁸ in proof of this assertion he refers to a number of passages in Cicero, Sallust, and Livy. A single, characteristic example may be given here. Cicero, *De Fato* 2, recounts his long conversation with the consul-designate Hirtius:

Being engrossed as we for our part were in seeking for a line of policy that might lead to peace and concord in the state. (*maxime nos quidem exquirantes ea consilia quae ad pacem et ad concordiam civium pertinerent.*)

In Sallust there is an instructive text in *Hist.* 1.77.13:

I pray you consider how the order of things is inverted; formerly public mischief was planned secretly, public defense openly . . . nowadays peace and concord are disturbed openly, defended secretly. (*Et quaeso considerate quam conversa rerum natura sit! Antea malum publicum occulte, auxilia palam instruebantur . . . ; nunc pax et concordia disturbantur publice, defenduntur occulte.*)

Here the combination of terms is clearly a summary of the “*bonum publicum*.” Also characteristic is Diodorus Siculus, *Hist.* 16.7.2: the inhabitants of Euboea “fell into strife among themselves” (ἐστασίασαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους); when many victims had fallen on both sides and the island was virtually devastated by this intestinal warfare, “at long last admonished by the disasters, the parties came into concord and made peace with one another” (μόγις ταῖς συμφοραῖς νοουβητηθέντες εἰς ὁμόνοιαν ἦλθον καὶ τὴν εἰρήνην συνέθεντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους). The background here is described by the term στασιάζειν, civil war; “concord” and “peace” are almost identical; the difference, in my view, consists in that with ‘homonoia’ the emphasis falls more on the inner disposition, with “peace” more on the external form of mutual relations. The connection in which this pair of concepts appears is also found in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.* 7.60.2, where a conflict between the patricians and the plebians is described; one of the consuls spoke:

78 P. Jal, “*Pax civilis—concordia*,” *Revue des études Latines* 34 (1961) 220.

Praising concord and peace, telling of the great good fortune which each of them brings to states, and inveighing against discord and civil wars, by which, he told them, many cities have been destroyed with all their inhabitants and whole nations had perished utterly. (ἐπαινῶν μὲν ὁμόνοιαν καὶ εἰρήνην, καὶ ὅσης εὐδαιμονίας ἐκάτερον τούτων αἴτιον ἐστὶ ταῖς πόλεσιν ἐπιλεγόμενος, κατηγορῶν δὲ διχοστασίας καὶ πολέμων ἐμφυλίων, ἐξ ὧν πόλεις αὐτάνδρους ἀπέφαινε ἀνηρήσθαι καὶ ἔθνη ὅλα διελωλέναι.) He exhorted them not to indulge their resentment,⁷⁹ nor, again, to take the worst of their fellow-citizens for their advisors when deliberating concerning matters of the greatest importance. (μὴδε τοῖς κακίστοις τῶν πολιτῶν χρῆσθαι συμβούλοις περὶ τῶν μεγίστων βουλευομένων.)

From this material it is completely clear that this combination of terms, sometimes broadened by other ideas, was a wide-spread conception of the well-being of the state, which could refer to situations within the bounds of the polis, or extend beyond it. So far as I have been able to ascertain, the combination appears for the first time in the middle of the first century before Christ, whereas in earlier Greek literature another combination, namely that of ὁμόνοια with φιλία, is usually encountered. P. Jal's extensive collection of material, which is derived exclusively from Latin literature, shows how the bloody civil wars that ravaged the Roman Empire in the first century B.C. provided the motivation for placing the virtue of "peace and concord" in a new light.⁸⁰ Whether he is right to suggest that this was a typical Latin combination, which has been taken over by the Greeks,⁸¹ may well be doubted.⁸² The origin and dissemination of the concepts is surely not exclusively connected, as is clear from the citations given above, with Stoic circles, as Sanders, in connection with 1 Clement, seems to think, whereby he refers to only one (!) text from Epictetus.⁸³

79 Compare with this 1 Clement 63:2: ἐάν . . . ἐκκόψῃτε τὴν ἀθέμιτον τοῦ ζήλους ὑμῶν ὀργὴν κατὰ τὴν ἔντευξιν, ἣν ἐποιησάμεθα περὶ εἰρήνης καὶ ὁμονοίας.

80 P. Jal, "*Pax civilis*," 210–31.

81 P. Jal, "*Pax civilis*," 221 on Plutarch, *Otho* 15, "reproduisant visiblement l'expression latine."

82 In his important article, Jal draws exclusively on the Latin sources and leaves out of consideration the Greek texts, of which examples have been given above; it is my intention to fill this lacuna to some extent. But above all, it is necessary to recognize, as our second study will show, that Greek thought and discussion about 'homonoia' is older than the Latin use of "concordia": the latter is certainly influenced by the former, as demonstrated by E. Skard, *Zwei religiös-politische Begriffe, Euergetes-Concordia* (Oslo, 1932).

83 L. Sanders, *L'Hellénisme de Saint Clément de Rome et le Paulinisme*. *Studia Hellenistica* 2 (Louvain: Universitas Catholica Louvainiensis, 1943) 129; the text will be discussed below.

One may therefore conclude that the formula belonged to the terminology commonly in use in the Imperial period to describe the well-being of the state.

With respect to the mutual relation between the two concepts, one may say that “peace” refers more to the external affairs of the state, “concord” more to internal relations. Livy 4.7.1 says “concord at home insured peace abroad” (*concordia domi, pacem etiam foris praebuit*). The same idea is expressed very clearly by Epictetus, *Diss.* 4.5.35:

These are the judgments which produce love in the household, concord in the state, peace among the nations, make a man thankful toward God, confident at all times. (ταῦτα τὰ δόγματα ἐν οἰκίᾳ φιλίαν ποιεῖ, ἐν πόλει ὁμόνοιαν, ἐν ἔθνεσιν εἰρήνην, πρὸς θεὸν εὐχάριστον, πανταχοῦ θαρροῦντα.)

According to Jal, concordia is “chargé d’une certaine valeur affective.”⁸⁴ Peace with the outside world can sometimes be absent; but so long as unanimity between the citizens is maintained, the welfare of the state is guaranteed. In his discourse “On ‘homonoia,’” Aelius Aristides says that wars are not so disastrous for the state as discord.⁸⁵ What is meant by ‘homonoia’ is the harmonious relations between the citizens mutually, and the accent lies upon the inner disposition; by “peace” is meant the normal, undisturbed relations which a state maintains in dealing with foreign lands. From this one may also understand why the civil wars, apart from all the other losses of human life and goods, were so disastrous; through such discords the state was assaulted in its very being and existence. For this very reason, the complementary formula “Peace and Concord” became the watchword for the well-being of the state.

When 1 Clement, therefore, characterizes itself as an ἐντευξις . . . περὶ εἰρήνης καὶ ὁμονοίας, this is not a casual description. No, for ancient readers a light must have dawned, if they had not understood earlier, when Clement used this widely current formula⁸⁶ by which the well-being and happiness of a

84 P. Jal, “*Pax civilis*,” 219.

85 Aelius Aristides, *Orat.* 42, p. 786 D; *Orat.* 44, p. 831 D.

86 In three of the four passages where “peace and concord” appear together in 1 Clement, that is, in 61:1, 63:2, and 65:1, the word “peace” precedes; only in 60:4 is the order reversed. When one considers the distribution of instances of both terms in the letter as a whole, then one can say that Clement lays more emphasis on ‘homonoia’. For this reason it is noteworthy that, nevertheless, where the words appear combined, “peace” is named first. In the non-Christian texts one also finds in by far the most cases “peace” before “concord” (see the material cited above, pp. 270 ff.). Is this an indication that Clement here indeed works with a fixed formula that was known to him?

community was designated. He writes a letter on account of the troubles in Corinth, where the well-being of the *ekklesia* is threatened by divisions.

In Greek thought and discourse about the state since the middle of the 5th century B.C., 'homonoia' played a central role. Among the Romans, the idea was further elaborated by the use of *concordia*. Thus when Clement speaks of "peace and concord," he makes use of concepts which already have a long history behind them in an established context of thought. What light, in consequence, is cast upon the letter as a whole, we shall examine in greater detail in our second study. In order to see clearly the intention of the author, it is necessary, however, to investigate more closely another characterization which the letter gives of itself, namely, that it is a συμβουλή (58:2).

1 Clement as 'sumboule'

In 58:2 the writer says: "receive our counsel" (δέξασθε τὴν συμβουλήν ἡμῶν). One usually translates the word συμβουλή in accordance with the usage found in the Greek dictionaries,⁸⁷ as "counsel" or "advice," and neglects any more detailed explanation. Nor is any attention paid to this word in dealing with the questions of introduction which this letter raises. But the context in which the word occurs indicates that more is meant than a simple giving of advice.

The above-mentioned sense in which συμβουλή stands is preceded by the exhortation:

Let us then be obedient to his most holy and glorious name, and escape the threats which have been spoken by wisdom aforetime to the disobedient (ἀπειθοῦσιν), that we may tabernacle in confidence on the most sacred name of his majesty (58:1).

This is clearly the practical consequence which the writer draws from the lengthy citation of Proverbs 1:23–33 in 57:3–7 (from which the words "that we may tabernacle in confidence" are derived);⁸⁸ as always, in this passage from Holy Scripture, the destruction of all those who do not listen to God's word is announced. This is, therefore, the application to their own situation and serves as the Word of God itself to the leaders of the *stasis* in Corinth, to bring

87 See Liddell–Scott–Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 1677; W. Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, 1540.

88 Cf. on the verb κατασκηνώ, W. Michaelis in G. Kittel–G. Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch* (1964) Vol. 5, 389 ff.

about submission to the presbyters. In 57:1 the instigators of the division are addressed directly and forcefully:

Learn to be submissive, putting aside the boastful and the haughty self-confidence of your tongue. (μάθετε ὑποτάσσεσθαι ἀποθέμενοι τὴν ἀλαζόντα καὶ ὑπερήφανων τῆς γλώσσης ὑμῶν αὐθάδειαν 57:2).

For it is better to have a modest place in the flock of Christ⁸⁹ than to appear to be important and to lose the ultimate salvation that God has promised. This is confirmed by means of a citation from Proverbs 1.

The structure of the passage is thus as follows: in 57:1–2 a direct address to the leaders of the *stasis* in Corinth, with a reference to the grave dangers that one incurs on the basis of God's threatening words in Prov. 1:23 ff.; then in 58:1 the "application" of the word of Scripture to all Christians, in which the author speaks generally, "let us," with the typical change from "you" to "us" that is found so often in this epistle.⁹⁰ Thereupon follows, then, in 58:2 another direct address: "receive our *sumboulé*." Noteworthy here is that he does not say: "receive the instruction of God's word," or something of the sort, but "our counsel." This is more than a piece of well-intended advice of one sort or another, but goes to "the heart of the matter"; it points the way to the resolution of the conflict and the restoration of unity in Corinth. Even if *sumboulé* in 58:2 should refer back to what immediately precedes in 58:1, the latter is not merely an admonition, but the way to escape from the difficulties, and to live together as the *ekklésia* of God. Therefore, *sumboulé* here refers to the whole content of the letter.

How important this "counsel" is considered to be by the writer is apparent from what follows:

And there shall be nothing for you to regret, (which is concluded by an oath, solemnly affirmed) for as God lives and as the Lord Jesus Christ lives and the Holy Spirit, the faith and hope of the elect, he who with lowliness of mind and eager gentleness has without backsliding performed the decrees and commandments given by God shall be enrolled and chosen in the number of those who are saved through Jesus Christ. (ζῆ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς καὶ ζῆ ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἥ τε πίστις καὶ ἡ ἐλπίς τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν, ὅτι ὁ ποιήσας ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ μετ' ἐκτενοῦς ἐπιεικείας

89 On this point, see ch. 54.

90 The examples are spread throughout the entire letter. We shall return later to several points.

ἀμεταμελήτως τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ δεδομένα δικαιώματα καὶ προστάγματα, οὗτος ἐντεταγμένος καὶ ἐλλόγιμος ἔσται εἰς τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν σωζομένων διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.)⁹¹

From these words it is apparent what great importance this *sumboulé* has.

Now it must be remarked that in connection with talk about ‘homonoia’, the word *symbolé* acquires a pregnant meaning. It is well known that in the Greek world there was much discussion of this theme, naturally by orators, but for the most part occasioned by concrete events. The nature of this undertaking was expressed by the verb συμβουλεύω, as the following texts show.

When Aelius Aristides in his speech to the Rhodians “On ‘homonoia’” makes a comment on his own involvement in the matter of the discord prevailing in Rhodes, he reckons himself among those who “come to offer counsel”; he appeals for the approval of his hearers to concur in the view that:

Just as you believe those courtroom arguments to be most truthful, to which there are the most and best witnesses, so also in matters of advice, the most trust must be shown to those who have the most and weightiest witnesses. (ὥσπερ τῶν ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις λόγων τούτους ἀληθεστατους ἡγείσθε, ὧν ἂν πλείστοι καὶ γνωριμώτατοι μάρτυρες ᾦσιν, οὕτως καὶ τῶν εἰς συμβουλὴν ἡκόντων, οἷς ἂν πλείστοι καὶ σπουδαϊότατοι μάρτυρες ᾦσιν, τούτοις μάλιστα χρῆναι πιστεῦειν.)

He then refers to Homer, “the common advisor of the Greeks” (τὸν κοινὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων σύμβουλον), citing the well-known words of *Od.* 6.182 ff. [*Orat.* 44, p. 826 D.].⁹² The comparison which Aristides makes with a plea in court is interesting, as we shall see in what follows.

91 This oath-formula has an Old Testament flavor, see Ruth 3:13; 1 Sam. 14:39, 45; 19:9. Noteworthy is the fact that here not a “trinitarian” (cf. 46:6), but a fivefold “confession” is found; cf. Epist. Apost. 5 (16), where, alongside of “Father, Son and Holy Spirit,” the holy church and the forgiveness of sins are mentioned as parts of the confession of faith. On the expression, “the number of those who are saved through Jesus Christ,” see my article: “Le nombre des élus dans la première épître de Clément” in *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 42 (1962) 237–46.

92 Cf. also in the same *Orat.* 44, p. 827 D.: “If, therefore, that advisor thought that it was now opportune to pray for *concord*, even for those who were going to set up housekeeping, indeed it is the duty of those who have lived in a city from antiquity, and one which is so famous, to regard all else as secondary to this” (εἰ τοίνυν καὶ τοῖς μέλλουσιν οἰκῆσιν οἰκίαν ἤδη συνεύχεσθαι καιρὸν ἡγεῖτο ὁ σύμβουλος περὶ τῆς ὁμονοίας, ἥ που τοῖς γε ἐκ παλαιοῦ πόλιν οἰκοῦσι καὶ ταύτην οὕτως ἐπιφανή πάντα τὰ ἄλλα δεύτερα τούτου ποιεῖσθαι προσήκει). Earlier

Of the sophist Gorgias, Philostratus, *Vit. Soph.* 1.9.4 says:

For seeing that Greece was in conflict with itself, he became the counselor of concord to them. (στασιάζουσιν τὴν Ἑλλάδα ὁρῶν ὁμονοίας σύμβουλος αὐτοῖς ἐγένετο.)⁹³

In his famous and oft-read *Panegyrikos*, Isocrates defines the aim of his speech thus:

I have come before you to give my counsel on the war against the barbarians and on concord among ourselves. (ἦκω συμβουλευέσων περὶ τε τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους καὶ τῆς ὁμονοίας τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς αὐτοῦς, *Paneg.* 3.)⁹⁴

In Dio Chrysostom's speech to the inhabitants of Nicomedia "On 'homonoia,'" one finds at the very beginning that citizenship has been bestowed upon Dio and he sees as the one and only reason for it his "desire and ability to give advice on issues affecting the commonwealth" (τὸ συμβουλευεῖν ἐμέ τι περὶ τῶν κοινῇ συμφερόντων); he hopes to prove useful to the city, because cities "need counselors to provide safety by their politics" (δεῖ δὲ καὶ συμβούλων ἵνα σώζονται ταῖς πολιτείαις), and Dio asserts that, insofar as it is possible for him, he will "not shrink from aiding the city by giving advice on matters of greatest importance" (οὐκ ὀκνήσω περὶ τῶν μεγίστων συμβουλευόντων ὠφελεῖν τὴν πόλιν, *Orat.* 38.1 ff.; see also what follows). Aelius Aristides concludes his address "On 'homonoia' to the Cities" (*Orat.* 42) with the words:

in the same speech, *Orat.* 44, p. 825 D., he characterizes his own discourse περὶ ὁμόνοιαν as a συμβουλή, and asks: "For is it not strange for you to blame the speaker because his *advice* is well-known, stale, and accepted by all, yet for you yourselves not to dare to make use of such obvious arguments . . . ?" (πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἄτοπον τῷ μὲν λέγοντι μέμφεσθαι ὡς λίαν γνώριμα καὶ παλαιὰ καὶ πᾶσι δοκοῦντα συμβουλεύει, αὐτοὺς δὲ μὴ τολμᾶν χρῆσθαι τοῖς οὕτω φανεροῖς . . .).

93 Whether this is a correct evaluation of Gorgias is of no importance; of interest is only the combination of σύμβουλος and ὁμόνοια, of which Philostratus provides a good example.

94 See also Isocrates, *Ad Philipp* 16: "For I am going to advise you to champion the cause of concord among the Hellenes and to campaign against the barbarians" (μέλλω γάρ σοι συμβουλεύειν προστῆναι τῆς τε τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὁμονοίας καὶ τῆς ἐπὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους στρατείας), and *Epist.* 3.2: "I counseled you that . . . you should bring all the Greeks into concord" (συνεβούλευον . . . εἰς ὁμόνοιαν καταστήσαι τοὺς Ἕλληνας).

Let me give you the best counsel with all good will and courage, and do you show that it is not pointless to tell you these things, but that you know how to make use of those who offer the best advice (καμοί τε πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰρήστω μετὰ πάσης εὐνοίας ἅμα καὶ ἀνδρείας τὰ βέλτιστα, ὑμεῖς τε ὅτι οὐ μάτην ταύτ' ἐστὶ λέγειν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἀλλ' ἵστε χρῆσθαι τοῖς τὰ βέλτιστα συμβουλευούσι, τουτ' ἐπιδείξατε) for their approval (*Orat.* 42, p. 796 D.).⁹⁵

Dio Cassius has Cicero say:

It is necessary for us to give counsel to you... let us be in concord, and both we ourselves shall be saved and all the others shall be preserved (δεῖν ἡμᾶς συμβουλευεῖν ὑμῖν... ὁμονήσωμεν, αὐτοὶ τε σωθησόμεθα καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἅπαντας περιποιήσομεν (*Hist. Rom.* 44.23.3).

We may also recall Iamblichus, *Vit. Pythag.* 9.45: Pythagoras who was the first to give counsel so that they might preserve the existing concord (ὃ δὲ πρῶτον μὲν συνεβούλευσεν) to build a temple to the Muses, “in order that they might preserve the existing concord” (ἵνα τηρῶσι τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν ὁμόνοιαν).

The terminology is thus very consistent: when one spoke on ‘homonoia’, one gave “advice” to put an end to strife and discord, and to live in concord with one another. Clement is therefore in good company, in terms of ancient conceptions, with his way of referring to his writing.

A lively image of the way in which this occurred is provided by a few speeches of Dio Chrysostom. When he comes to speak on this subject in Nicomedia, because the city was at loggerheads with Nicaea, he says that he could indeed attempt to correct one or another smaller matters, but he prefers first to win their confidence by dealing with the most important issue, knowing full well that in so doing he is putting his reputation at risk.⁹⁶ He wishes to

95 Cf. also in this speech, *Orat.* 42, p. 777 D.:... οὐδ' ἂν αὐτὸς συνεβούλευον τὰ οἴκοι βλάπτοντας τὰ τῶν πλησίων κοσμεῖν. *Orat.* 42, p. 791 D.: τῷ μὲν γὰρ αὖξιν ἐθέλειν τὰς αὐτῶν πατρίδας καὶ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα κοσμεῖν οὐδ' ἂν εἰς νεμεσήσειεν, ὃ δὲ τούτῳ πρόσεστιν ἀηδίας ἀφελεῖν (that is, the removal of the discord) ἔγωγε συμβουλεύω. Cf. also in *Orat.* 44, p. 840 f. D.: “as long as they listened to the best *counsel* and were concordant, ... they were saved. But when they fell into dissension, they perished, except for one man [Odysseus] who gave them the best advice” (κάκεῖνοι μέχρι μὲν τῆς ἀρίστης γνώμης ἡκρωῶντο καὶ ὡμονοοῦν, ἀπείχοντο τῶν βῶων καὶ ἐσώζοντο, ἐπεὶ δὲ διέστησαν, ἀπώλοντο πλὴν ἐνὸς τοῦ τὰ βέλτιστα συμβουλευόντος). See also Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.* 7.60.2 (see above, p. 273).

96 Dio Chrysostom, *Orat.* 38.3: τί δὲ παθὼν ἢ τί βουλόμενος οὐχ ὑπὲρ τῶν μικροτέρων συμβουλεύω πρότερον, οὐδὲ ἐν ἐκείνοις ἀποπειρώμαι τοῦ δήμου τῆς εὐπειθείας, ἀλλ' εὐθύς ἀξιῶ κινδυνεύειν περὶ τοῦ μεγίστου συμβουλευών; He explains: “It is because it seems to me far easier to

persuade them and appeals to them to endure his “advice” with patience in the matters about which he is there to counsel them.⁹⁷ But he takes care to refute a few objections which may be present in the minds of his hearers: why does he offer advice unbidden? Whence does he derive the privilege of the floor, when others who were active in politics and native-born have not presumed to give advice?⁹⁸ And then he proceeds: “on behalf of concord I have come to speak, a fine word and a fine thing” (ὕπὲρ γὰρ ὁμονοίας ἐρῶν ἔρχομαι,⁹⁹ καλοῦ μὲν ὀνόματος, καλοῦ δὲ πράγματος, *Orat.* 38.6). Here one sees clearly the orator about his work of “giving advice” to an assembly of the people. He seeks to counter all resistance, because he senses that they are not ready to hear his advice; he attempts to appeal to their good-will. What he hopes to achieve is to persuade his hearers; he cannot compel or command them.

In another speech, addressed to his fellow-citizens, Dio says:

What would be the good of my presence here, if I should fail to lead you to such a policy by persuasion, having constantly engaged with you in discussions conducive to concord and amity, so far as I am able, and trying in every way to eradicate unreasonable and foolish enmity and strife and contention? (Τί γὰρ ἂν εἴη τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐπιδημίας ὄφελος, εἰ μὴ πρὸς τὰ τοιαῦτα πειθομένους ὑμᾶς ἄγοιμεν, λόγων αἰεὶ συναγωγῶν ὁμονοίας καὶ φιλίας συναράμενοι, καθ’ ὅσον οἰοί τε ἐσμεν, ἔχθραν δὲ καὶ ἔριν καὶ φιλονεικίαν ἄλογον καὶ ἀνόητον ἐξαιρῶντες πάντα τρόπον; (*Orat.* 48.6).

persuade men concerning the weightiest matters than concerning those which are slighter or trivial” (ὅτι πολλῶ μοι δοκεῖ ῥᾶον εἶναι πείσαι περὶ τῶν μεγίστων ἢ τῶν μικροτέρων). By minor matters he means those which cause harm, by the greater matters it is a question of “being saved” (σώζεσθαι). One who has refused to be persuaded (πεισθῆναι) regarding the greater things, will not even listen concerning the minor matters.

97 Dio Chrysostom, *Orat.* 38.4: ὅτι μὲν οὖν, ἐὰν ὑπομείνητε τὴν συμβουλίαν, πειθήσεσθέ μοι περὶ ὧν συμβουλευῶν παρὲμι καὶ σφόδρα θαρρῶ.

98 Dio Chrysostom, *Orat.* 38.4: ἵνα οὖν μοι μὴ ταῦτα προαπαντήσῃ παρ’ ὑμῶν. Τί δὲ συμβουλευεῖς σὺ περὶ ὧν ἡμεῖς; τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐδὲ βουλευόμεθα; (note the word-play here). Τί δὲ σεαυτῷ λόγον μεταδίδους, οὐ σοὶ μὴ μετέδομεν ἡμεῖς; Διὸ τί δὲ τοσούτων πεπολιτευμένων παρ’ ἡμῖν ἀνδρῶν ἐπιχωρίων, εἰσποιητῶν, ῥητόρων, φιλοσόφων, γερόντων, νέων, οὐδέποτε οὐδεὶς ἐτόλμησεν ἡμῖν συμβουλευσαὶ ταύτην τὴν συμβουλίαν; ... εἴτε γὰρ πεισθῆσεσθε, ἀξίον, ἐστὶν ἀκοῦσαι τοῦ τὰ λυσιτελῆ λέγοντος. εἴτε ἐφ’ ὑμῖν ἀποκεῖται τὸ πεισθῆναι...

99 Cf. above in fn. 97: παρὲμι. See also Aelius Aristides, *Orat.* 44, p. 826 D. (previously, in fn. 92) and *Orat.* 42, p. 771 D.: φέρε δὴ καὶ τὰς πόλεις ἐπέλθω τὰς περὶ τοῦ πρωτείου νῦν ἀμιλλωμένας καὶ παρ’ ὧν τῆς ἐρίδος ἀρχὴ συμβαίνει. In *Orat.* 44, p. 824 D. he excuses himself because the condition of his health does not permit to come in person.

From these speeches of Dio and Aelius Aristides on 'homonoia' we can see that a certain relationship existed between the orator and his hearers, but it is not a relationship in which the orator was under constraint. He comes forward at his own initiative, where he sees 'homonoia' in danger, and seeks through the art of persuasion to preserve or to restore unanimity.

Here in Dio we have a snapshot of sorts; here one sees how it went in practice in the daily life of a Greek city in the Imperial period, whenever someone wished to offer "counsel" of one sort or another. Dio was no exception in his attitude and approach. Indeed one might claim just the opposite. "The art of persuasion," to cite the title of a book on ancient rhetoric,¹⁰⁰ found, as is well known, many enthusiastic devotees wherever Greek culture was spread since the time of its flowering in classical Athens. The art of eloquence was taught and learned everywhere during the time of the Roman Empire.

This is all so well known that it does not need to be discussed in detail. Only one aspect deserves to be elucidated in connection with our subject, namely, that the appearance of συμβουλευω, σύμβουλος, συμβουλή in this connection is not accidental. Συμβουλή was, as Aristotle's treatise on eloquence makes clear, a *terminus technicus* in the theory of *Rhetorica*. Since Aristotle's time (Aristotle *Ars Rhet.* 1.3), a distinction was made between three genres of speeches: the *dikanikon*,¹⁰¹ the *epideiktikon*, and the *sumbouleutikon*. This division was also taught in the rhetorical schools of the Imperial period, as evidenced by Clement's contemporary Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* 3.3.14:

For they asserted that the parts of rhetoric were, panegyric, deliberative and forensic. (*partes enim rhetorices esse dicebant laudativam, deliberativum, iudiciale.*)

Leaving aside for a moment the two other sorts, when we turn our attention to the *sumbouleutikon*, we see that its purpose is to give "advice" to those who deliberate on a certain matter. It has a twofold character: "the deliberative kind is either hortatory or dissuasive," συμβουλήs δὲ τὸ μὲν προτροπή, το δε ἀποτροπή, Aristotle, *Ars Rhet.* 1.3; cf. Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* 3.8.6: "its functions are twofold and consist in advising and dissuading," (*officiis constat duobus suadendi ac dissuadendi*). The goal was to make clear what was "expedient" (τὸ συμφέρον) and what was "harmful" (τὸ βλαβερόν): "for he who exhorts recommends a

100 G. Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963). On what follows, see also R. Volkmann, *Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer in systematischer Übersicht dargestellt* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1885), 294 ff. (repr., Hildesheim, 1963).

101 See the comparison that Aelius Aristides, *Orat.* 44, p. 826 D. (for the text, see above, p. 154) makes between the *dikanikon* and the *sumbouleutikon*.

course of action as better, and he who dissuades advises against it as worse" (ὁ μὲν γὰρ προτρέπων ὡς βέλτιον συμβουλεύει, ὁ δὲ ἀποτρέπων ὡς χεῖρον ἀποτρέπει, Aristotle, *Ars Rhet.* 1.3); cf. Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* 3.8.22: "some have held that the three main considerations in an advisory speech are honour, expediency and necessity. I can find no place for the last" (*partes suadendi quidam putaverunt honestum, utile, necessarium. Ego non invenio huic tertiae locum*); others made even more detailed distinctions, *Inst. Orat.* 3.8.26: "right, justice, piety, equity, mercy" (*fas, iustum, pium, aequum, mansuetum*); but Quintilian places all of these under the heading of that which is "honorable" (*honestum*).¹⁰² The means by which this goal was achieved was "persuasion" (in addition to these texts from Quintilian, see also the texts from Tacitus and Suetonius discussed above, p. 148, and those of Dio Chrysostom and Plutarch, above, p. 156; see also Ecphantus, apud Stobaeus 4.7.64: "a unison of the many is harmonized with persuasion," τῶν πολλῶν ὁμοφωνία μετὰ πειθοῦς συνυδοῖσα). Among the five most prominent subjects that might be themes for the *sumbouleutikon*, Aristotle also names war and peace (*Ars Rhet.* 1.4; cf. Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* 3.8.14). Still another observation of Quintilian (*Inst. Orat.* 3.8.39–40) is important:

The minds of such an audience are not to be moved by discoursing on the nature of virtue, which they ignore, but by praise, by appeals to popular opinion, and if such vanities are of no avail, by demonstration of the advantage that will accrue from such a policy, or more effectively perhaps by pointing out the appalling consequences that will follow the opposite policy... For I am not sure that most men's minds are not more easily influenced by fear of evil than by hope of good. (*animus deliberantis non ipsi honesti natura, quam ille non respicit, permovendus, sed laude, vulgi opinione et, si parum proficit haec vanitas, secutura ex his utilitate, aliquanto vero magis obijcienda aliquos, si diversa fecerint, metus... nescio an etiam naturaliter apud plurimos plus valeat malorum timor quam spes bonorum.*)

102 A more detailed subdivision with corresponding themes is found in Aristides, *Rhet.* 1.5 (Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci* [Lipsiae: Teubner, 1854] II p. 503 f.): τὸ δίκαιον, τὸ συμφέρον, τὸ δυνατόν, τὸ ῥᾶδιον, τὸ ἀναγκαῖον, τὸ ἀκίνδυνον, τὸ καλόν, τὸ εὐσεβές, τὸ ὅσιον, τὸ ἥδῦ καὶ τὰ ἐναντία τούτοις... τὸ δὲ νόμῳ δίκαιον θεωρεῖται ἐν προστάξει καὶ ἐν ἀπαγορεύσει, τὸ δὲ συμφέρον συνίσταται ἐκ τόπων τεσσάρων... τήρησις ὧν ἔχομεν ἀγαθῶν, ἐπίκτησις ὧν οὐχ ἔχομεν ἀγαθῶν, ἀποφυγὴ τῶν περιστάσεων κακῶν, κάλυψις τῶν ἐπιφερομένων κακῶν... ταῦτα δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ εὐσεβές, αἱ τιμαί, οἱ ἔπαινοι, αἱ μνήμαι, αἱ φιλῖαι, αἱ πίστεις, τῶν προγόνων αἱ δόξαι, καὶ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα τοῖς ἔργοις, ἃ οὐ δεῖ κατασιχνύνειν, καὶ τὸ τηρεῖν τὰ πρέποντα ἐν τῷ βίῳ, οἷαν εὐταξίαν, ἀπλότητα, ἀλήθειαν, φιλίαν. It is interesting to read 1 Clement with these characteristics in mind.

When 1 Clement is read from this perspective, then one sees that, with its exhortations and admonitions,¹⁰³ it fits entirely within this framework. In Corinth certain things were in dispute, cf. 1:1, “concerning the questions disputed among you” (περί τῶν ἐπιζητουμένων παρ’ ὑμῖν πραγμάτων);¹⁰⁴ thus a *sumboulé* was in order. In keeping with the dogmatic framework of the *Christian* Clement, naturally the decisive question for him lies, not in terms of what is “beneficial or harmful,” but in terms of the commandments of God and God’s judgment (we shall return to this point in our second study). Clement is conscious of the fact that he does not write on his own authority,¹⁰⁵ but he appeals to the knowledge of the Holy Scripture which his readers possess, as he says in praise of them, and which he repeatedly calls to remembrance.¹⁰⁶ the word of God shows where the ways of obedience and disobedience lead. When the

-
- 103 A. Stuiber, “Clemens Romanus I” in Th. Klauser, *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1957) Vol. 3, col. 192 lays emphasis upon the category νουθέτησις, but this is not a rhetorical genre, and in Clement (cf. 7:1; 56:2, 6) the word has a purely negative ring = warning; on the other hand, Clement offers, in keeping with the nature of the *sumbouleutikon*, both kinds of advice, hortatory and dissuasive, in which the former element predominates. The statement of Stuiber: “Die Gabe dieser νουθέτησις gilt als Charisma (im weiteren Sinne: 38:1 f.; 63:2)” is, in my view, wholly unwarranted, since not one word in the text is devoted to this matter.
- 104 Cf. Knopf, *Die apostolischen Väter I*, 44, who rightly observes that it is not a matter of questions which the Corinthians have asked of Rome, but about which they mutually dispute with each other (παρ’ ὑμῖν).
- 105 See 59:1, “But if some be disobedient to the words which have been spoken by him (God) through us, let them know that they will entangle themselves in transgression and no little danger” (ἐὰν δέ τινες ἀπειθήσωσιν τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ δι’ ἡμῶν εἰρημένους, γινωσκέτωσαν, ὅτι παραπτώσει καὶ κινδύνῳ οὐ μικρῷ ἑαυτοὺς ἐνδύσουσιν). 63:2, “if you are obedient to the things which we have written through the Holy Spirit” (ἐὰν ὑπήκοοι γενόμενοι τοῖς ὑφ’ ἡμῶν γεγραμμένοις διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος).
- 106 Cf. 62:3, “And we had the more pleasure in reminding you of this, because we knew quite well that we were writing to men who were faithful and distinguished and had studied the oracles of the teaching of God” (καὶ ταῦτα τοσοῦτω ἡδίων ὑπερμνήσαμεν, ἐπεὶ διὰ σαφῶς ἡδαιμεν γράφειν ἡμᾶς ἀνδράσιν πιστοῖς καὶ ἐλλογιμωτάτοις καὶ ἐγκεκυφόνσιν εἰς τὰ λόγια τῆς παιδείας τοῦ θεοῦ); in addition, see 53:1, “For you have understanding, you have a good understanding of the sacred Scriptures, beloved, and you have studied the oracles of God. Therefore we write these things to remind you” (ἐπίστασθε γὰρ καὶ καλῶς ἐπίστασθε τὰς ἱερὰς γραφάς, ἀγαπητοί, καὶ ἐγκεκύφατε εἰς τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ. πρὸς ἀνάμνησιν οὖν ταῦτα γράφομεν); see also, before this, the “deepening” in the Holy Scripture mentioned in 40:1, “we have looked into the depths of the divine knowledge” (ἐγκεκυφότες εἰς τὰ βάθη τῆς θείας γνώσεως), and 45:2 “You have studied the Holy Scriptures, which are true, and given by the Holy Spirit” (ἐγκεκύφατε εἰς τὰς ἱερὰς γραφάς, τὰς ἀληθεῖς, τὰς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου).

order established by God is destroyed through discord, salvation is put at risk. His readers should be mindful of Jesus' words (46:7, μνήσθητε τῶν λόγων Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. See also 13:1f.).

This applies not only to the Christians in Corinth, but naturally also to those in Rome. For this reason one does not find in the letter a direct address to the "ringleaders" in Corinth, not even as a general consideration of the advantages of 'homonoia', but always the hortatory "we" (see above p. 277). This comes clearly to expression in a comparison of the statement in 62:2:

It is necessary to remind you that you are bound to please almighty God by living in concord, etc. (ὕπομιμνήσκοντες δεῖν ὑμᾶς . . . τῷ παντροκράτορι θεῷ ὁσίως εὐαρεστεῖν, ὁμονοοῦντας κτλ.),

with 7:1, where, after demonstrating the tragic consequences of jealousy and strife by means of all sorts of examples from earlier and later times, the writer says since he knows himself to be involved in the same struggle:

We are not only writing these things to you, beloved, for your admonition, but also to remind ourselves. (ταῦτα, ἀγαπητοί, οὐ μόνον ὑμᾶς νουθετοῦντες ἐπιστέλλομεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑαυτοὺς ὑπομιμνήσκοντες.)

This last text is not an indication that the writer intends "to reach beyond the immediate occasion and present a generally valid admonition,"¹⁰⁷ but a profound awareness of standing in the same situation in the world before God.

One sees the elements of *protopré* (exhortation) and *apotropé* (dissuasion) combined with one another in several passages where a positive suggestion is followed by a negative warning in the form of a participial phrase, so for example in 30:1, 3 (see above, p. 260), 35:5 (above, p. 260), 58:1 (above, p. 276).

The "*timor malorum*" (fear of evil) and the "*spes bonorum*" (hope of good), to use Quintilian's language, play a large role in this letter, although they are viewed from the perspective of God's eternity. One can see this in the wording of 59:1:

But if some be disobedient to the words which have been spoken by him (God) through us, let them know that they will entangle themselves in transgression and no little danger. (ἐὰν δέ τινες ἀπειθήσωσιν τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ

107 R. Knopf, *Die apostolischen Väter I*, 55: "über den vorliegenden Anlass hinauszugreifen und eine allgemein gültige Mahnrede zu halten."

δι' ἡμῶν εἰρημένοις, γινωσκέτωσαν ὅτι παραπτώσει καὶ κινδύνῳ οὐ μικρῷ ἑαυτοὺς ἐνδήςουσιν

or in 28:1,

Since then all things are seen and heard by him, let us fear him (God), and leave off from foul desires of evil deeds, that we may be sheltered by his mercy from the judgments to come. (πάντων οὖν βλεπομένων καὶ ἀκουομένων, φοβηθῶμεν αὐτόν, καὶ ἀπολίπωμεν φαύλων ἔργων μιαρὰς ἐπιθυμίας, ἵνα τῷ ἐλέει¹⁰⁸ αὐτοῦ σκεπασθῶμεν ἀπὸ τῶν μελλόντων κριμάτων)

for no one can escape God, as is demonstrated by a citation from Ps. 139:7–10. The terminology of the *sumboulé* is heard most clearly in 14:1–2:

Therefore it is right and holy . . . for us to obey God rather than to follow those who in pride and unruliness are the instigators of an abominable jealousy. For we shall incur no common harm, but great danger,¹⁰⁹ if we rashly yield ourselves to the purpose of men who rush into strife and sedition, to estrange us from what is right. (δίκαιον οὖν καὶ ὅσιον . . . ὑπηκόους ἡμᾶς μᾶλλον γενέσθαι τῷ θεῷ ἢ τοῖς ἐν ἀλαζονείᾳ καὶ ἀκαταστασίᾳ μυσεροῦ ζήλους ἀρχηγοῖς ἐξακολουθεῖν. βλάβην γὰρ οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν, μᾶλλον δὲ κίνδυνον ὑποίσομεν μέγαν, ἐάν ῥιψοκινδύνως ἐπιδῶμεν ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς θελήμασιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἵτινες ἐξακοντίσουσιν εἰς ἔριν καὶ στάσεις, εἰς τὸ ἀπαλλοτριῶσαι ἡμᾶς τοῦ καλῶς ἔχοντος.)

108 There are repeated references to the “mercy” of God in this letter; see ἔλεος in 2:4; 9:1; 50:2; 56:16; οἰκτιρμός in 9:1; 20:11; 23:1; 56:1; 60:1.

109 Clement also refers to “danger” in 41:4, “You see, brethren, that the more knowledge we have been entrusted with, the greater *danger* do we risk” (ὁρᾶτε, ἀδελφοί. ὅσῳ πλείονος κατηξιώθημεν γνώσεως, τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον ὑποκεῖμεθα κινδύνῳ), and in 47:7, “so that you bring blasphemy on the name of the Lord through your folly, and are moreover creating *danger* for yourselves” (ὥστε καὶ βλασφημίας ἐπιφέρεισθαι τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου διὰ τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀφροσύνην, ἑαυτοῖς δὲ κίνδυνον ἐπεξεργάζεσθαι). In the last case one may wonder what is meant by “danger,” which has been interpreted as “danger of losing eternal salvation” or as “danger (of persecutions)”; the former view is advocated i.e. by Knopf, *Die apostolischen Väter I*, 124, the latter by von Harnack, *Einführung*, 117, among others; it is difficult to give a conclusive answer, since the context provides no light; but in keeping with the importance that is given to κίνδυνος elsewhere in the epistle, and when one takes into account what a sin it was that on their account “the name of the Lord is reviled” (see on this subject my article “Die Rücksicht auf die Reaktion der Nicht-Christen als Motiv in der altchristlichen Paränese” in *Judentum-Christentum-Kirche*, Festschrift for Joachim Jeremias [Berlin, 1964], 221–233), the former view seems to me more probable.

In connection with the concept of “*fas*” (right) which Quintilian (see above, p. 159) names as one of the “topics” of the *sumbouleutikon* among some rhetoricians, reference may be made to a very conspicuous word-use by Clement in the statement of purpose in 63:1 and 2:

It is therefore right that we should respect so many and so great examples, ... and take up the position of obedience, so that ceasing from vain sedition we may gain without any fault the goal set before us in truth (2) ... if ... you root out the wrongful passion of your jealousy. (θεμιτὸν οὖν ἐστὶν τοῖς τοιούτοις καὶ τοσοῦτοις ὑποδείγμασιν προσελθόντας ... τὸν τῆς ὑπακοῆς τόπον ἀναπληρῶσαι, ὅπως ἡσυχάσαντες τῆς ματαίας στάσεως ἐπὶ τὸν προσκείμενον ἡμῖν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ σκοπὸν δίχα παντὸς μώμου καταστήσωμεν (2) ... ἐάν ... ἐκακόψῃτε τὴν ἀθέμιτον τοῦ ζήλους ὑμῶν ὁγών.)

That which is “beneficial” is also mentioned in 48:6, “to seek the common good of all and not one’s own benefit” (ζητεῖν τὸ κοινωφελὲς πᾶσιν, καὶ μὴ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ). Repeated reference is made in the epistle to the benefits of God (see 19:2–21:3) and the good prospects which these bestow, as for example, in 35:1–2:

How blessed and wonderful, beloved, are the gifts of God! Life in immortality, splendor in righteousness, truth in boldness, faith in confidence, continence in holiness. (ὡς μακάρια καὶ θαυμαστά τὰ δῶρα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀγαπητοί. ζωὴ ἐν ἀθανασίᾳ, λαμπρότης ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἀλήθεια ἐν παρρησίᾳ, πίστις ἐν πεποιθήσει, ἐγκράτεια ἐν ἀγιασμῷ),

and in 50:1:

See, beloved, how great and wonderful is love, and that of its perfection there is no expression. (ὁρᾶτε, ἀγαπητοί, πῶς μέγα καὶ θαυμαστόν ἐστιν ἡ ἀγάπη, καὶ τῆς τελειότητος αὐτῆς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξήγησις.)

With respect to the specific content of this *sumboule* and its relationship to other writings on ‘homonoia’, there shall be discussion later. From the material presented here, it is clear that 1 Clement exhibits all of the characteristics that belong to a work of this genre, in accordance with the theory propounded by the teachers of rhetoric.¹¹⁰

110 On the stylistic figures which are used in this letter, one should see H. Hemmer, *Les Pères Apostoliques, II. Clément de Rome* 2 (Paris, 1926) XXXV ff.; the subject merits more detailed investigation.

Implications in Particular

Connected with the nature of 1 Clement as a *sumboulé* are specific phenomena in this writing which are significant for the conception of the letter as a whole and its function. On the other hand, these features also serve to confirm by their presence the correctness of the thesis that one has to do here with a work that belongs to the genre *sumbouleutikon*.

A) It is noteworthy that a *prooemium* is lacking; the writer does not introduce himself and offers no *captatio benevolentiae*. Nor was that necessary in a deliberative speech. But one must begin somewhere and not just forge ahead in a random manner. Hence he begins, just as Aelius Aristides, *Orat.* 44 (beginning), p. 824 D., with an excuse. Aristides could not come to Rhodes in person to give his address because of his illness; Clement likewise refers to the delay caused by the misfortunes, which have suddenly come upon the Roman community. Otherwise there is no particular reason to think here of a rhetorical trope (no prescription from antiquity is known to me in this respect). The reason for the writing is given as the harm done to the community by the shame that has been brought upon the venerable name. The panegyric on the community in Corinth that follows (1:2–2:8) is not only comparable to the words of praise which Aelius Aristides (many decades after Clement!) devotes to the various cities that live in discord with one another in his *Orat.* 42, p. 772 ff. D., but also serves as a bright background of the former state of affairs, against which the present discord stands out clearly, providing, as it were, a portrait of the ideal of happiness that might be restored.

B) In this letter, the cause of the internecine conflict is spoken of only in the most general terms. The fact of the removal of certain presbyters from office is reported, but what actually happened in Corinth remains vague. For this reason, various theories and speculations have arisen about the background of these events.¹¹¹ Precisely in connection with the problems of church organization this is of great importance. Was there, for example, a conflict between Amt und Geist? Naturally every researcher will deplore the lack of clear information (I find myself asking whether Clement does not say more when seen in connection with the Greek concept of 'homonoia').¹¹² Yet there is not the least reason to be suspicious that Clement is not well informed or that he has distorted the affair.

111 In addition to the book by Walter Bauer mentioned in n. 26, see W. Lütgert, *Amt und Geist im Kampf* (Gütersloh, 1911) 50–111.

112 I hope to investigate this point more thoroughly in the third study.

The writer of this letter on peace and concord is not exceptional in this respect. With regard to the two orations of Aelius Aristides, De Leeuw gives voice to the complaint that the cause of the dispute is never mentioned.¹¹³ A similar observation can also be made about the discourses of Dio Chrysostom "On Concord." One cannot attribute this lack to the ignorance of the writers; someone like Dio was a direct witness. One does not have to do here with a failing of these authors; rather, the matter is completely in accord with the prescriptions for this genre. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Rhet.* 10.14 makes this clear in the following words:

The deliberative form has no need of narration (that is, the exposition of the matter in dispute); for those deliberating know what they are considering, and they need to learn what is to be done, not that about which one must take counsel. (ὅλη μὲν ἰδέα συμβουλευτικὴ διηγήσεως οὐ δεῖται. ἴσασι γὰρ οἱ βουλευόμενοι περὶ ὧν σκοποῦνται, καὶ δέονται μαθεῖν ὃ πρακτέον ἔστί, οὐχ ὅπερ βουλευτέον.)¹¹⁴

The accuracy of this statement can hardly be disputed.

For us, who are alone dependent upon this source of information for our knowledge of the conflict in Corinth, it is certainly regrettable that Clement is not more precise in his reports; we would gladly trade some of the homiletical passages for more exact data. But the matter did not present itself in this way to the first readers; they knew exactly what had taken place. In light of the rule that governed the *narratio* of a deliberative address, one might say, with surprise and delight, that in ch. 44 ff. Clement has reported too much!

C) To this genre there also belongs the use of examples (*παραδείγματα*, *exempla*). It is a general conviction, Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* 3.8.66 remarks, that *exempla* have their place in a deliberative kind of discourse:

As regards the use of examples, practically all authorities are with good reason agreed that there is no subject to which they are better suited, since as a rule history seems to repeat itself and the experience of the past is a valuable support to reason. (*Usum exemplorum nulli materiae magis convenire merito fere omnes consentiunt, cum plerumque videantur respondere futura praeteritis habeaturque experimentum velut quoddam rationis testimonium.*)

113 C.A. de Leeuw, *Aelius Aristides als bron voor de kennis van zijn tijd* (Amsterdam, 1939) 59.

114 See also Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* 3.8.10.

Surviving specimens of this genre demonstrate the correctness of this statement. One may note the observation of Dio Chrysostom, *Orat.* 38.10:

And as many as have published histories, providing a pattern for practical application, have shown concord to be the greatest of human blessings. (ὅσοι τὰς ιστορίας ἐξέδοσαν ἐπὶ παραδείγματι αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων ἀπέδειξαν αὐτὴν [‘homonoia’] μέγιστον οὖσαν τῶν ἀνθρωπειῶν ἀγαθῶν.)

Clement does not make use of the word *παράδειγμα*, but instead the term despised by the Atticists, *ὑπόδειγμα*.¹¹⁵ As such he names figures from the Old Testament (5:1; 46:1), but also persons from his own time (6:1), as well as figures from profane history (55:1). These “examples” serve not only as illustrations and proofs of the opinions which Clement expresses, but also give form to the ideal of life for the Christians; they should respect these examples and imitate them in their lives (see 63:1). The word *ὑπογραμμός* (model) appears in the same sense—applied to Paul (5:7), to the humble suffering of Jesus (16:7), and to God, the Creator of “good works” (33:8). But even when it is not expressly stated that an “example” is present, this means of argumentation is extensively used, as one can easily see by reading through the epistle. In Clement these examples serve not only as guidance from the past to the future, but also to show what instructions God’s Word gives, in order to teach how one ought, and ought not, to respond to God’s commands.

It is worth noting that Clement does not, like Dio Chrysostom and Aelius Aristides, draw his examples from the treasury of Greek history, which contains so much material on the theme of ‘homonoia’, but derives practically all of his examples from the Old Testament, through which he wanders freely, adducing one example after another. One has often expressed surprise that Clement also made use of examples from profane history and mythology (6:2, 4; 55:1), and has seen in this a sign of the “Hellenization of Christianity.” Actually just the opposite is the case! When one views this writing in terms of its literary genre and in the context of the Greek ‘homonoia’-literature, then it is amazing that examples from profane literature are drawn upon so sporadically, and that such an overwhelming number are derived from the Old Testament. If the writer wishes to impress us with his erudition, then it is not in ancient history, but in the Holy Scripture. And one wonders whether the fact that he argues in this way, and can so argue, says something about the attitude and nature of the community in Corinth?

115 See Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, col. 1669.

D) The theme of 'homonoia' belongs to the topics which are dealt with in deliberative discourses, as one can see from Cicero, *De Oratore* 1.56:

And indeed, when, while a man is speaking, as often happens, such common-places have cropped up on which one ought to speak—of the immortal gods, of dutifulness, concord, etc . . . (*cum illi in dicendo incidere loci, quod persaepe evenit, ut de diis immortalibus, de pietate, de concordia . . . sit dicendum . . .*).

And Dio Chrysostom sums up the principal points on which he might have spoken in *Orat.* 48.14:

If my purpose on this occasion were to speak in behalf of concord, I should have had a good deal to say about not only human experiences but celestial also, to the effect that these divine and grand creations, as it happens, require concord and friendship; otherwise there is danger of ruin and destruction for this beautiful work of the creator, the universe. (εἴ μοι προέκειτο νῦν ὑπὲρ ὁμονοίας λέγειν, εἶπον ἂν πολλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων καὶ περὶ τῶν οὐρανίων παθημάτων, ὅτι τὰ θεῖα ταῦτα καὶ μεγάλα ὁμονοίας τυγχάνει δεόμενα καὶ φιλίας εἰ δὲ μὴ, κίνδυνος ἀπολέσθαι καὶ φθαρῆναι τῷ καλῷ τούτῳ δημιουργήματι τῷ κόσμῳ.)¹¹⁶

Dio does not present a discourse on concord here, but only refers to the example of the small animals, the bees and the ants.

A number of treatments of this theme are known only by name;¹¹⁷ the fragments that remain are too sparse to give an impression of the whole. We are fortunate, as we have already mentioned, that the discourses of Dio Chrysostom (4) and Aelius Aristides (2) have been preserved from the Imperial period, along with several speeches of this kind which have been included in the histories of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Dio Cassius, which may be

¹¹⁶ Cf. on this point 1 Clement 20 and the discussion which is devoted to this topic; thus the theme of the harmony of the heavens belongs to the *topoi* of a discourse on 'homonoia'. With respect to "danger," one thinks of the use of this term in 1 Clement, see above.

¹¹⁷ Those of Antiphon (4th century), Chrysippus, Demetrius (attested in Cicero, *Ad Atticum* 9.9.2), Iamblichus. G.W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969) 68 adds to the report that Galen also wrote on this theme, the observation: "a theme particularly beloved in the second century," but does not illustrate this statement with references to texts.

mentioned in this connection. All of these authors stand in the tradition of ancient rhetoric.

Whenever one reads these discourses, one always meets with the same complex of ideas in connection with the exhortation to 'homonoia' and the warning against the disastrous consequences of discord, in which the latter aspect is given greater emphasis than the former. However, comparison of these works does not reveal any precise agreement in structure or composition, not even between works by the same author. Thus the author of such a discourse will not have worked in accordance with an established schema. Each dealt in different situations with the same theme, with similar motifs, but with variations which constituted separate parts of each speech, recognizable, from case to case, in various situations.

I hope I may be permitted to add an observation here of a general sort. The question may be raised whether we have always evaluated correctly persons who had received rhetorical training—the mark of every "civilized" man in the Imperial period. One often reads statements such as "this is a fixed topos" or "not an original thought, but very widespread," and then one apparently regards the matter as settled. To some, it appears that these authors, for example, the Christian apologists of the second century, are not much more than trained parrots, who only rehearse platitudes with empty phraseology. Now I will not claim the opposite and say that all of these were profound, original thinkers,¹¹⁸ but only that they were living men, not marionettes, and that one must measure these men by the standards of their time. In antiquity, eloquence and tradition were evaluated differently than they are today. Moreover, we must be careful not to fall victim to an optical illusion: we shelve these discourses alongside each other in our libraries or on our desks, but in reality they were delivered under various circumstances and in different places before very diverse audiences. Therefore all sorts of parallel ideas can self-evidently be present, which are completely legitimate, and are not viewed as repetitions of commonplaces.

In this literature which is so strongly governed by the prescriptions of rhetoric, one pays attention, with both eye and ear, to the way in which the prescriptions are applied, and to the way in which the variations are introduced.¹¹⁹ Thus one should bear in mind that when a writer makes use of a certain topos, this does not mean that he expresses ideas thoughtlessly, taking them as filler

118 This often appears to be the alternative. But this is a false opposition. Moreover, the number of "profound, original thinkers" have never been very great in the course of history.

119 As a parallel, one thinks here of the modern investigation of the significance of rhetoric for the appreciation of the literature of the Renaissance and its classicism.

from some newspaper. One can be certain—to take an example from the circle of our own research—that when Clement spoke about the “danger” incurred by those who disrupted the concord of the community (see above, p. 286), this was meant by him in bitter earnest.

When one reads discourses such as those of Dio Chrysostom and Aelius Aristides, one may conclude that these were not school-declamations “On ‘homonoia,’” which had no relation to concrete circumstances, and which for the same amount of money could well have been a speech on a different theme. No, even if the circumstances are no longer clear to us, and we can no longer reconstruct precisely the situation with which the author had to deal, it is nevertheless certain that the situation existed, and that these orators wished to speak a “Wort zur Lage.”¹²⁰ This was undoubtedly also the case for the Christian community of Rome in regard to the community of Corinth.

The Intervention of Rome in the Affairs of Corinth

We have already noted in our introduction that there has been an ongoing debate over the nature of the intervention of the community of Rome in the problems in Corinth: is this letter an expression of brotherly love or of the will to power?¹²¹ In our view, the fact that this letter is sent as a *sumboule* throws light upon this question.

How has contact between Rome and Corinth been established in this case? Nothing suggests that it was initiated from the side of Corinth, that a question was posed by the Corinthian community;¹²² or that the deposed presbyters have made an appeal to Rome seeking to bring in Rome’s church leaders as mediators. The only text that offers support for this view is 47:7, “this report

120 A good example of the difference between “theory” and “praxis” can be seen in Dio Chrysostom *Orat.* 38.6: “but if I proceed to add forthwith concord with whom, I fear lest, while you may be convinced that concord of and by itself is fine, you may believe that being concordant with those persons with whom I claim you should be concordant is impossible” (ἀν δὲ εὐθὺς προσθῶ περὶ τῆς πρὸς τίνας ὁμονοίας, τοῦτο δέδοικα μὴ τὴν μὲν ὁμόνοιαν αὐτὴν ἀφ’ ἑαυτῆς καλὴν εἶναι πιστεύσητε, τὸ δὲ πρὸς τοὺτους ὁμονοεῖν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, οἷς ὁμονοεῖν φημι δεῖν, ἀδύτατον εἶναι νομίσητε). Cf. on this point Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.* 10.3.1: τὸ μὲν οὖν καταλύσασθαι τὰ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐγκλήματα καὶ μὴ χρῆσασθαι γνῶμη περὶ τῶν κοινῶν, ὥς ὑπετίθεντο οἱ χρησμοί, πάντες ὡμολογοῦν, ὅπως δ’ ἂν τοῦτο γένοιτο καὶ ἀπὸ τίνων ἀρξαμένων εἴκειν τοῖς ἐτέροις τὸ διάφορον παύσαιτο τὸ στασιάζειν, οὐ μικρὰν αὐτοῖς παρεῖχεν ἀπορίαν.

121 See above, pp. 249–250.

122 See above n. 104.

has not only reached us" (αὕτη ἡ ἀκοή οὐ μόνον εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐχώρησεν); but from this one can only conclude that the Christians in Rome have heard a rumor of the quarrel, something which is easily conceivable with the frequent commerce between the two cities. But that excludes any official request from the Greek community. Therefore one must assume that the community in Rome has sent the letter *sponte sua*. How has Rome sought to resolve the conflicts in Corinth? By sending this *sumboulé* with the request to accept it (58:2) and to "root out the anger"—ἐκκόψητε τὴν ὀργήν (63:2). How this worked is not clear to us, since we have only this source of information at our disposal; but from the contemporary context we know of interesting cases that illustrate how it went in analogous situations.

A lively account of a similar situation of *stasis* is given to us by Dio Chrysostom, *Orat.* 48.13 in a speech addressed to the inhabitants of his native Prusa. He says that a great city can endure all kinds of discord for a time, and yet it is terrible:

Do not the Athenians accuse one another, do they not drive men into exile, do they not put one party into the council and drive out the other? Is not everything subject to upheaval as in an earthquake, everything unsettled, nothing stable? They have reached the point where their own leaders cannot help them any more, but, just as in the case of incurable diseases, require physicians from abroad. Then comes what happens with intractable horses—when the bit fails to hold them in check, a curb is put upon them from without.

Here the fat is in the fire, and aid from the outside is needed.

In 1 Clement, this aid in relation to the division in Corinth is given by Rome, but the author must still ask that they receive his *sumboulé*. For this was not to be taken for granted. Orators such as Dio could make great efforts to restore 'homonoia'; but it was not guaranteed that the hearers would accept unbidden advice, as we have already seen from another passage in Dio (see above, pp. 280–81).

Different, but no less clear, is the account given by Plutarch in *Reipubl. ger. praecepta* 32. He illustrates how quarrels of all kinds can lead a city to rack and ruin, and defines the task of the statesman in this way:

Always to instill concord and friendship in those who dwell together with him and to remove strifes, discords, and all enmity. (ὁμόνοιαν ἐμποιεῖν καὶ φιλίαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους αἰεὶ τοῖς συνοικοῦσιν, ἔριδας δὲ καὶ διχοφροσύνας καὶ δυσμένειαν ἐξαίρειν ἅπασαν.)

Plutarch also uses the verb *ἰσθαι* of the effectiveness of the statesman's effort. The best means to this goal is "persuasion" (*πειθῶ*), that is, for the statesman to show himself in his private differences mild and conciliatory, persisting without anger in his original reasons for disagreement, and treating no one with contentiousness nor with anger (*τὸ παρέχειν ἑαυτὸν ἐν ταῖς ἰδίαις διαφοραῖς ἡμερον διαλλακτὴν, ἀμήνιτον ἐπὶ τῶν πρώτων αἰτιῶν μένοντα καὶ μηδενὶ προστιθέντα φιλονεικίαν μηδ' ὀργήν*). Whoever proceeds in this way will find that "others also obey him" (*ὑπηκόους ἔξει καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους*).

Here in 1 Clement it is not a single individual who seeks to restore peace in Corinth, but the Roman community. The latter is represented¹²³ in the persons of three Christians who are mentioned by name (63:3, *ἐπέμψαμεν δὲ ἄνδρας πιστοὺς καὶ σώφρονας ἀπὸ νεότητος ἀναστραφέντας ἕως γήρους ἀμέμπτως ἐν ἡμῖν, οἵτινες καὶ μάρτυρες ἔσονται μετὰ ὑμῶν καὶ ἡμῶν*, and 65:1, *τοὺς δὲ ἀπεσταλμένους ἀφ' ἡμῶν Κλαύδιον Ἐφῆβον καὶ Οὐαλέριου Βίτωνα σὺν καὶ Φορτυνάτῳ ἐν εἰρήνῃ μετὰ χαρᾶς ἐν τάχει ἀναπέμψατε πρὸς ἡμᾶς*). What is actually the precise role of this embassy in this affair? Insofar as I am able to ascertain, practically no attention has been devoted to this question up to the present, and one is generally content simply to mention the fact. On the grounds of the word "witness" in 63:2, one author sees in these emissaries persons who must go to Corinth in order, then, upon their return to Rome, to bear witness before a kind of ecclesiastical court, so that on this basis a decisive verdict might be passed.¹²⁴

123 In discussion with the author, Dr. Mohrmann and Dr. W. de Boer call attention, in this connection, to the role played by the emissaries of the communities who come to visit Ignatius on his journey to Rome. These persons truly "represent" the communities by which they are sent. Ignatius, Eph. 2:1 mentions a number of names of persons who have come to see him, "in whose persons I have seen you all in love" (*δι' ὧν πάντας ὑμᾶς κατὰ ἀγάπην εἶδον*). Magn. 2:1, "Forasmuch then as I was permitted to see you in the person of Damas, your godly bishop, and the worthy presbyters..." (*ἐπεὶ οὖν ἡξιώθην ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς διὰ Δαμά τοῦ ἀγιοθέου ὑμῶν ἐπισκόπου καὶ πρεσβυτέρων ἀξιῶν...*); there follow the names of the persons who visited him in Smyrna (Magn. 15). Trall 1:1–2 mentions the visit of the bishop Polybius to Smyrna, "so that I saw your whole congregation in his person. I received therefore your godly benevolence through him" (*ὥστε μετὰ πᾶν πληθὸς ὑμῶν ἐν αὐτῷ θεωρεῖσθαι. ἀποδεξάμενος οὖν τὴν κατὰ θεὸν εὐνοίαν δι' αὐτοῦ ἐδόξασα*); on εὐνοία, cf. also the use of this word in relation to the bond between various cities, to which the inscriptions cited in n. 135 below bear witness. In this connection, one is also reminded of the rule "the one sent is as the sender" (cf. on this point K.H. Rengstorff in Kittel-Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch* (1933) Vol. 1, p. 415 ff.), which has played such a large role in the discussion of the origin and significance of the apostolate. But Clement does not make reference to this; he speaks of "witnesses."

124 Thus, S. Lösch, "Der Brief des Clemens Romanus, die Probleme und ihre Beurteilung in der Gegenwart" in *Studi dedicati alla memoria di Paolo Ubaldi*; (Milan, 1937) 187.

In the formulation of the nature and purpose of this embassy, the following statements merit our attention:

1) the persons are not only introduced by name, but also with a summary of their good characteristics. They are men who meet high standards, “trustworthy and wise”, which qualifies them excellently for the task of helping to remove the “madness” (1:1; 21:5; 46:7) of division (for σωφρονεῖν in this connection, see, for example, Andocides, *De Mysteries* 109... εἰ ἐθέλομεν οἱ πολῖται σωφρονεῖν τε καὶ ὁμονοεῖν ἀλλήλοις, and Aelius Aristides, *Orat.* 42, p. 779D.), for whose trustworthiness the community of Rome can vouch, because they have lived their whole lives long “blamelessly” (for ἀμέμπως, see 44:3 ff.; cf. also Acts. 26:4f.: τὴν μὲν οὖν βίωσίν μου ἐκ νεότητος... ἴσασι πάντες Ἰουδαῖοι... ἐάν θέλωσι μαρτυρεῖν...). This is, therefore, a “good witness”¹²⁵ and a recommendation. Naturally, this does not have to be the case, if they have nothing more to do in Corinth than to see how the land lies, and then afterwards to bring the report of the outcome back to Rome; it would have sufficed that one was convinced of their good qualities in Rome alone. But obviously they must also be acceptable in Corinth; in my opinion, this implies that they have more to do merely than to hand over the letter, that they are commissioned to work toward the attainment of peace in the community.

2) These persons should be “witnesses between you and us” (μάρτυρες μεταξὺ ὑμῶν καὶ ἡμῶν). The group consists of three members; possibly one should think, with Fischer,¹²⁶ of the “biblical” rule: “Only on the evidence of two or three witnesses shall a charge be sustained” (Deut. 19:15),¹²⁷ although no word here in 1 Clement alludes to or hints at this rule. Clement does not say: “they shall be witnesses against you with us,” but rather, “between you and us,” in which both parties clearly stand beside each other on the same level. Can one really describe their function with the words: “sie sollen entscheiden, ob die Korinther auf die Mahnungen der Römer gehört haben” (they should determine whether the Corinthians have listened to the admonitions of the Romans)?¹²⁸ Yet here it is not a matter of deciding, but of witnessing.

125 See on this point Knopf, *Die apostolischen Väter I*, 71.

126 J.A. Fischer, *Die apostolischen Väter*, 105 n. 386a.

127 On this rule in the New Testament, one should see the study by H. van Vliet, *No Single Testimony. A Study of the Adoption of the Law of Deut. 19,15 par. in the New Testament* (Utrecht, 1958).

128 So, Knopf, *Die apostolischen Väter*, I, 149. He refers, in this case, to 65:1, but there it is only said that they should give a report. See also A. von Harnack, *Einführung*, 121: “Die Sendung der Männer, die feststellen sollen, ob die Korinthische Gemeinde die Mahnung der Römischen ausführen wird (emphasis mine, van Unnik), lässt diese als Oberkollegin erscheinen, in dessen Kraft die römische Gemeinde ihre Mahnung ergehen lässt, in einem

Although the commentators remain silent on the combination of “witnesses” with “between you and us,” we may observe that the combination is exceptional, and therefore noteworthy (up to the present, no good parallel in Greek texts has come to my attention). Perhaps one should regard this as a Semitism, since the phrase “witness between me and between you” appears several times in the Old Testament. Yet in such cases the Septuagint does not use the word μεταξὺ, but ἀνὰ μέσον. In these texts,¹²⁹ it is not human beings who appear as witnesses, but God, or a stone which has been erected for the purpose, is said to be a “witness”¹³⁰ between two parties to see that they remain true to an oath that they have sworn (one might almost think of the term “arbitrator” here rather than “witness”). Thus, one does not encounter a satisfactory parallel in the Old Testament. Such texts would furnish an analogy to 1 Clem 63:3 only if Clement had spoken of witnesses between the two parties in conflict in Corinth; but this is not the case: they are witnesses between the Christian communities in Corinth and Rome as a whole, and not between the agitators and Rome. Hence the expression must have a different meaning here, which can only be derived from the context.

solchen Fall von jeder Gemeinde in Anspruch genommen worden kann und soll. Aber wie viele Gemeinden haben den Gemeinsinn und den Mut besessen, dies zu tun?” This sort of consideration should count as an interpretation of the text!

129 J.A. Fischer, *Die apostolischen Väter*, 105 n. 396a refers to Gen. 31:44: as Jacob and his father-in-law Laban separate from one another, they make a covenant, καὶ ἔσται εἰς μαρτύριον ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ . . . ἴδε ὁ θεὸς μάρτυς ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ. A stone was set up as a pillar and Laban said: ὁ βουνὸς οὗτος μαρτυρεῖ ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ σήμερον (31:46); further he declared, ἐπίδοι ὁ θεὸς ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ, ὅτι ἀποστησόμεθα ἕτερος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑτέρου (31:49) . . . ὁ θεὸς Ἀβρααμ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ναχωρ κρινεῖ ἀνὰ μέσον ὑμῶν (31:52). Thereafter, one encounters the expression in 1 Sam. 20:23 in connection with the covenant between David and Jonathan: καὶ τὸ ῥῆμα, ὃ ἐλαλήσαμεν ἐγὼ καὶ σύ, ἰδοὺ κύριος μάρτυς ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ . . . (20:42) ὡς ὁμωμόκακεν ἡμεῖς ἀμφοτέρω ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου λέγοντες. Κύριος ἔσται μάρτυς ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον σπέρματος μου καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σπέρματός σου. The paraphrase of these passages in Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* throws no light on the meaning of the expression. In Joshua 22:27,28, one also finds the expression “witness between . . . and between . . .” in the Hebrew text, but the LXX here has μαρτύριον: an altar was built, ἵνα ᾗ τοῦτο μαρτύριον ἀνὰ μέσον ἡμῶν καὶ ὑμῶν καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν γενεῶν ἡμῶν μεθ’ ἡμᾶς . . . (22:28). . . . μαρτύριον ἐστὶν ἀνὰ μέσον ὑμῶν καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον ἡμῶν καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν υἱῶν ἡμῶν, cf. in this connection, Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* 5.1.27, §§ 112–113, σύμβολον . . . τεκμήριον . . . μάρτυς δ’ ἡμῖν τοῦ ἐπὶ τοιαύτῃ τὸν βωμὸν αἰτίᾳ κατασκευάσαι γένοιτο ὁ θεὸς ἀξιόχρεως.

130 On “God as witness” in the New Testament, see H. Strathmann in G. Kittel – G. Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch*, 4 (1942) 494; but this is not a specifically “biblical” concept, because one also finds many instances of the idea in Greek literature.

Now it is not so difficult to determine this meaning, since a precise description is given of what the emissaries are to do. They are to be witnesses, on the one hand, of Rome among the Corinthians:

That you may know that our whole care has been and is directed to your speedy attainment of peace. (ἵνα εἰδῆτε, ὅτι πάντα ἡμῖν φροντίς καὶ γέγονεν καὶ ἔστιν εἰς τὸ ἐν τάχει ὑμᾶς εἰρηνεύσαι, 63:4).

On the other hand, they are to be witnesses from Corinth to the community in Rome:

In order that they may report the sooner the peace and concord which we pray for and desire, that we also may the more speedily rejoice in your good order. (ὅπως θάπτον τὴν εὐκαταίαν καὶ ἐπιποθήτην ὑμῖν εἰρήνην καὶ ὁμόνοιαν ἀπαγγέλωσιν, εἰς τὸ τάχιον καὶ ἡμᾶς χαρῆναι περὶ τῆς εὐσταθείας ὑμῶν, 65:1).

Thus it is not at all their task to pass judgment or to gather material for an indictment; but they are also more than errand-boys. They must provide a testimony in Corinth of Rome's profound concern over the good outcome of events in Achaia's principal city, and later in Rome of Corinth's restoration. They can do this because they themselves were present¹³¹ and their activity had an importance that attached to the role of the witness in antiquity, and certainly also in early Christianity:¹³² whatever is declared before a witness is true. It is their task, then, to give solemn expression to the seriousness of Rome's concern for 'homonoia', and hopefully also to bring back speedily from Corinth an assurance of the realization of concord.

This embassy from Rome to Corinth in order to bring about the restoration of 'homonoia' is not an exceptional case devised by the Christian community for this special situation. One might have been content with the sending of a letter, but this did not suffice, so three witnesses were sent. This is a clear indication that the community of Rome dealt with the situation in accordance with established custom.

Aelius Aristides, *Orat.* 44, p. 833 D. reminds his audience in Rhodes of a piece of history, how, when their forefathers were once at odds with one another, the

131 For a trustworthy witness, both hearing and seeing were crucial, according to the conception current in antiquity.

132 One thinks of the role of "witness" in Luke's Acts as well as in the Johannine writings; see on this point, among others, the article of Strathmann mentioned in n. 130 above.

Athenians sent an embassy, and then he says that the Rhodians should now regard him, Aristides, as the mouthpiece of an embassy sent from all the cities, summoned for the settlement of the discord.¹³³ And in this connection, one should bear in mind that Aristides understood his task on this occasion as the giving of a *sumboulé* (see above, p. 278).

Even more interesting is the witness of a number of inscriptions from the pre-Christian period.¹³⁴ Here one meets with arbitrators whose visible qualities are praised (*καλοκάγαθός*) and who are sent (*ἀποστέλλω*) at the request of one city to another, in order there, as impartial arbitrators, to bring order to affairs and to restore concord in the city, destroyed by various processes. The terminology is very constant in the several cases, so that we have to reckon with a well established institution. One sees this in the correspondence between Priene and Iasos, for example (*Inscripfen von Priene*, ed. F. Hiller von Gaetringen [Berlin, 1906] nv. 53–54):

Since the people of Priene in former times were benevolent and fulfilled the requirements of friendship, we now deem it right to send as a judge a man good and true, Herokrates Andrios, who when he has arrived, will carry out the purposes of the arbitration, omitting nothing, but devoting all effort to the resolution of the difficulties, so that the parties may live together in concord. (ἐπειδὴ ὁ δῆμος ὁ Πριηνέων ἐν τε τοῖς πρότερον χρόνοις εὖνους ὦν καὶ φίλος διετέλει καὶ νῦν ἀξιωσάντων ἡμῶν ἀποστέλλει δικαστὴν ἀπέστειλεν ἄνδρα καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθὸν Ἡεροκράτην Ἄνδριον ὃς παραγενόμενος τὰς μὲν συνέλυσεν τῶν δικῶν οὐθὲν ἐλλιπῶν προθυμίας, ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος ἵνα συλλυθέντας οἱ ἀντίδικοι τὰ πρὸς αὐτοὺς μετὰ ὁμονοίας πολιτεύονται.)¹³⁵

133 Aelius Aristides, *Orat.* 44, p. 833 D.: τοσοῦτον κακὸν ἢ στάσις ταῖς πόλεσι καὶ τοσοῦτον ἀγαθὸν τὸ θέλειν ὡς τάχιστα παύσασθαι, εἰ δὲ δεῖ καὶ τῶν ὑμετέρων προγόνων Ἀργείων ἀναμνησθῆναι, λέγεται καὶ τούτους ταραχθέντας ἐν ἀλλήλοις, Ἀθηναίων πρέσβων ἀφικομένων ὡς αὐτοὺς καὶ διδασκάντων ὡς αὐτοὶ τὰ σφέτερ' αὐτῶν ἔθεντο, ὑπακοῦσαι καὶ τὴν στάσιν ἐκποδῶν ἀναλόντας πάλιν εἰς ταῦτον ἐλθεῖν. Several elements in this citation exhibit interesting parallels with 1 Clement: τάχιστα, see above n. 35; ἀναμνησθῆναι cf. 1 Clem. 53:1 (where Aristides refers to Greek history, Clement recalls the Holy Scripture, see above); on ὑπακοῦσαι, cf. below. Aelius Aristides, *Orat.* 44, p. 833 D.: νῦν τοίνυν . . . παρὰ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων τούτων χρὴ νομίζειν πρεσβείαν κοινὴν ἥκειν ὡς ὑμᾶς ἐπὶ τὰς διαλύσεις προκαλουμένην, προηγορεῖν δὲ ἡμᾶς συνδεομένους ἃ νομίζομεν πάντη βέλτιστα ὑμῖν εἶναι.

134 See on these inscriptions, W.W. Tarn and G.T. Griffith, *Die Kultur der hellenistischen Welt* (Darmstadt, 1966) 104–105.

135 The above citation is from nv. 53, *Inscripfen von Priene*. Other examples are as follows: *Inscripfen von Priene*, nv. 61: ἀπέστειλαμ πρὸς ἡμᾶς δικαστὰς καλοὺς καγαθοὺς, καθότι

From this one can see that, when amicable relations existed between cities, it could lead to an appeal being made and accepted that arbitrators be sent who by their unimpeachable integrity were able to bring resolution to the existing conflicts. The similarity with the situation in 1 Clement consists of the bond that existed between the two cities (cf., for example, the *exordium*), the mission of certain designated men, who are recommended because of their outstanding characteristics, and the restoration of the community (cf. also 48:1); but there is also this difference: there is no evidence of an appeal for help from the side of Corinth, that the emissaries bring about the reconciliation of the quarreling parties by their intervention. The comparison only serves to emphasize the last mentioned fact more strongly.

But neither do the emissaries have the task of reporting on the situation in Corinth, so that one or another verdict can be reached in Rome. On their return, so it is hoped, they should report that affairs in Corinth are in order. But the community there must itself come to a resolution of the difficulties. We have already discussed (see above, p. 276 ff.) the character of this letter as a *sumboulé*. Such a writing aims, by means of persuasion, to give good advice that will put an end to conflict by bringing the readers to a decision. Accordingly, little use is made of the imperative, but rather of the adhortative, whereby the 1st person plural predominates. When obedience is demanded, appeal is made to the will and word of God, as revealed in the Holy Scripture. Moreover, the writer also knows himself to be subject to the same authority (9:1; 13:3; 14:1). Nor

ἡξιώσαμεν (there follow the names of the arbitrators) οἱ παραγενόμενοι τὰς μὲν διέκριναν τῶν δικῶν ὀρθῶς καὶ δικαίως ἀπὸ πάντος τοῦ βέλτιστου, τὰς δὲ διέλυσαν, ἴσους αὐτοὺς παρασχόμενοι τοῖς διαφορομένοις, ἔσπευσαν δὲ καὶ τοὺς διαφορομένους ἀποκαταστήσαι εἰς ὁμόνοιαν, ἐποίησαντο δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀναστροφὴν τὴν παρ' ἡμῖν μετὰ πάσης εὐκοσμίας καὶ ὁσιότητος. Nr. 8, request of Priene to the Phocaeans: ἀπέστειλεν ἡμῖν ἄνδρας καλοὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς ἀκόλουθα πράττοντας τῇ πρὸς τὸν δῆμον αὐτῶν ὑπαρχούσῃ εὐνοίᾳ, οἳ τε παραγενόμενοι δικασταὶ πᾶσαν παρέσχοντο φιλοτιμίαν πρὸς τὸ διαλύειν τοὺς ἐν τοῖς ἐγκλήμασιν ὄντας, καὶ τὰς μὲν ἐδίκασαν τῶν δικῶν τῷ ψήφῳ κατὰ τοὺς νόμους ὀρθῶς. τὰς δὲ συνέλυσαν ἴσως καὶ δικαίως, εἰς ὁμόνοιαν καὶ προθυμίαν προαιρούμενοι τὸμ Πριηνέων καθίσταται. *Inscr. Graec.* VII 21 from Megara, a resolution of the council and the people: ἐπειδὴ ἀποστειλάντων ἁμῶν πρεσβεῖς ἐς Μέγαρον περὶ δικαστηρίων αἰτήσιος, Μεγαρεῖς δὲ βουλόμενοι διατηρεῖν τὴν διὰ προγόνων ὑπάρχουσαν φιλίαν ταῖς πόλεσιν ποτ' ἀλλάλας ἔδωκαν δικαστὰς καὶ ὑπογραμματέα ἄνδρας καλοὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς, οἵτινες παραγενόμενοι τὰν τε παρεπιδημίαν καὶ ἀναστροφὴν ἐποίησαντο ἀξίως ἑκάτεραν τὰν πόλιν καὶ τοὺς ἔχοντας τὰς δικὰς συνέλυσαν καὶ εἰς ὁμόνοιαν κατέστασαν σπουδὰς καὶ φιλοτιμίας οὐθὲν ἐλλιπόντες. See also *Inscr. Graec.* XI 4, 1052; XII 5, 722; XII 7, 15; *Inscriptionen aus Magnesia am Mäander*, ed. O. Kern (Berlin, 1900) nv. 101: . . . εἰς ὁμόνοιαν ἀποκαθιστάνες τὸ πολίτευμα, ἐποίησαντο δὲ καὶ τὴν παρεπιδημίαν καλὴν καὶ εὐσχήμονα κατ' ἀξίαν ἀμφοτέρων τῶν πόλεων. . . .

does 63:2, ὑπήκοοι γενόμενοι τοῖς ὑφ' ἡμῶν γεγραμμένοις διὰ τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος, stand in contradiction to this, for this text must be read in light of 59:1, ἐὰν δέ τινες ἀπειθήσωσι τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ δι' ἡμῶν εἰρημένοις. For this use of ὑπήκοος, one should compare the application of the term by Plutarch (*Reipubl. ger. praecepta* 32, see above, p. 294).

It is not Rome which roots out the problem, but the community in Corinth must itself take action to root out this godless division. To those who have been the instigators of strife, an appeal is made to depart, to go away, and to do what the πλῆθος, that is, the community¹³⁶ commands (54:2). If, however, they persist in disobedience, then they are threatened not with the anathema of Rome, but with the judgment which the Word of God passes (58:1; 59:1); they are warned of the danger which they run.¹³⁷ The community of Rome does not speak "in the name of the Lord," but always refers to the Scripture.¹³⁸

All of this is in complete agreement with the words of 56:1, where the community of Rome clearly defines its task and its role in this affair and gives a conclusive answer to the question of how persons there in Corinth should regard the relationship:

Let us then intercede for those who have fallen into any transgression, that meekness and humility be given to them, that they may submit, not to us, but to the will of God. (ἡμεῖς οὖν ἐντύχωμεν περὶ τῶν ἔν τιτι παραπτώματι ὑπαρχόντων, ὅπως δοθῇ αὐτοῖς ἐπιείκεια καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνη εἰς τὸ εἶξαι αὐτοὺς μὴ ἡμῖν ἀλλὰ τῷ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ.)

Here every possibility of misunderstanding is eliminated: the rebellious in Corinth should be obedient to God's will, not to Rome. The sending of this *sumboulé* is coupled with a prayer to God, who alone is able to change hearts.

136 For πλῆθος with the meaning "people" in a juridical sense, see G. Delling in Kittel-Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch* (1959) Vol. 6, p. 274 ff.

137 See above, pp. 159–161.

138 See above, p. 160. B. Altaner, "Der 1. Clemensbrief und das römische Primat" in *Kleine patristische Schriften* (Berlin, 1967) 537–538, refers, in his critique of the article by van Cauwelaert, to the letters of later bishops at Rome, up to the time of Damasus in the 4th century, who exhibit the same style as 1 Clement. Since these writings are by men who are possessed of a consciousness of the special apostolic power of Rome, he concludes that the same must have been the case with Clement. It would necessitate a separate investigation in order to place these later epistles with respect to their literary genre. The conclusion that Altaner draws does not hold with respect to 1 Clement, because here the connection with and the nature of the *sumbouleutikon* is decisive.

If one asks after the motive that has brought the Christian community of Rome to write this letter, then, in my view, the statement of 59:2 supplies an answer. After reference has been made to the great danger which those incur who are disobedient to God's Word, it is said: "but we shall be innocent of this sin, and will pray with eager entreaty and supplication that the Creator of the Universe may guard unhurt the number of his elect that has been numbered in all the world." Accordingly, the community in Rome sets forth what the community in Corinth must do continue to live "in peace" and not be torn apart by strife (2:4).¹³⁹ Quarrels such as those in Corinth represent a danger to the totality of God's elect. Why should this declaration of innocence be made so explicitly? Was the warning given here, just as it is in other places in the letters, not sufficient? It has to do with the sin of disobedience "to what God has spoken through our mediation." But how can there be talk here of potential guilt, when one is involved in transmitting the word of God? There is no mention of conflicts in Rome of the same sort which occurred in Corinth. Is this, then, a solemn declaration with regard to the future: that Rome will never do such a thing? But in 7:1 expression is given to a profound consciousness of being involved in the same struggle as the Corinthians.

The sense of 59:2 must obviously be determined by consideration of other texts: a) 46:2 ff., where it is explained that the "elect" are the innocent and righteous, who, as appears from the preceding chapter, have always been the victims of persecution. According to the citation from Ps. 18:26 ff., one should cleave to them: b) 35:6, where the writer makes Paul's words from Rom. 1:32 his own, as he says that it is not only those who do evil things who are hateful to God, but also those who take pleasure in them, which is interpreted by a citation from Ps. 50:16 ff., where the words are found: "Thou hast done these things and I kept silent; thou didst suppose, O wicked one, that I shall be like unto thee." Rome will not be found guilty according to the rule: "whoever keeps silent agrees." The Romans are possessed of a profound consciousness of unity (47:6) and feel that, if they do not speak, they will participate in the sin of divisiveness and disobedience to God's word.

Rome sent this *sumboulé* in order to clear its own conscience. Hence, van Cauwelaert rightly saw Rome's intervention as an act of Christian solidarity.¹⁴⁰

This solidarity also captures our attention, when we see that the goal which the writing hopes to achieve, and that comes to expression in 63:2 with the

139 On this, see my article, to which reference is made in n. 91.

140 See van Cauwelaert, "L'intervention de l'Eglise de Rome," 275 (cf. above, p. 249). His principal argument, namely, the existing relationship between the *cities* of Rome and Corinth, is not relevant to this point.

exhortation “root out the wicked passion of your jealousy” (ἐκκόψητε τὴν ἀθέμιτον τοῦ ζήλους ὑμῶν ὀργήν), is actually mentioned earlier, but in this case employing the 1st person plural: 48:1, “let us then quickly put an end to this” (ἐξάρωμεν οὖν τοῦτο ἐν τάχει¹⁴¹), followed by a call to prayer:

And let us fall down before the Master, and beseech him with tears that he may have mercy upon us, and be reconciled to us, and restore us to our holy and seemly practice of love for the brethren. (καὶ προσπέσωμεν τῷ δεσπότῃ καὶ κλαύσωμεν ἱκετεύοντες αὐτόν, ὅπως ἴλεως γενόμενος ἐπικαταλλαγῇ ἡμῖν καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν σεμνὴν τῆς φιλαδελφίας ὑμῶν ἀγνὴν ἀγωγὴν ἀποκαταστήσῃ ἡμᾶς) (see also the texts cited in n. 135.)

The repeated “us” in this passage is significant. And here it becomes clearly visible that the restoration is not to be expected from human beings or by human beings, but rather that the reconciliation must come from an act of God.¹⁴² Finally, it is appropriate to devote a few words to the term by which the intervention of Rome is described. In this way, we return to the point from which this study took its departure. Until now, a definition of the concept ἔντευξις in 63:2 (see above, p. 253) has not been given. A great difference of opinion exists regarding the translation of this term: “Mahnung” (Knopf); “mahnende Eingabe” (von Harnack); “*exhortatio*” (Funk); “invitation” (Hemmer); “appeal” (Lightfoot); “prayer” (Clark); “Bitte” (Fischer); “plea or petition” (R.M. Grant).¹⁴³ In the old Latin translation, one finds the rendering “*denuntiatio*,” in the Syriac version, “prayer and exhortation.” Some of these translations may be dismissed

141 On the expression ἐν τάχει, see above n. 35 and n. 133; also in Plutarch, *Reipubl. ger. praec.* 32 in reference to the “cure” of *stasis*: ὅπως τὰ μὲν οὐδὲ ὅλως ἔσται, τὰ δὲ παύσεται ταχέως. . .

142 On “reconciliation” as the restoration of ‘homonoia’, see the citation by Plutarch, *Reip. ger. praec.* 32 (see above, p. 170) and Dio Chrysostom, *Orat.* 38.48, ὅτι μὲν καὶ λυσιτελῆσαι ταῖς πόλεσιν ἢ καταλλαγὴ γενόμενη . . . 49, διαλλαγέντων ὑμῶν. See also Dio Cassius, *Hist. Rom.* 44.25.3, κατηλλάγησαν. This subject will be discussed in greater detail in the second study.

143 Knopf, *Die apostolischen Väter* I, 149; von Harnack, *Einführung*, 48; F.X. Funk, *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera* 2 (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1901) I, 183 (with the explanation, on p. 182, that the word usually means “prayer” in Christian writers, but can be translated here as “exhortation,” with a reference to 2 Clem. 19:1); H. Hemmer, *Les Pères Apostoliques* 2 (Paris, 1926) II, 131; J.B. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers* 2, I.1, 185 (he also considers the translation “prayer” a possibility, with his eye on 1 Tim. 2:4–5 and Hermas, *Mand.* 10.2, and he gives this as the translation in ch. 60); W.K. Lowther Clark, *The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians* (London, 1937) 85; Fischer, *Die apostolischen Väter*, 105; R.M. Grant, *The Apostolic Fathers*, Vol. 2: *First and Second Clement* (New York, 1965) 98.

at once, because no basis is to be found for them in Greek usage.¹⁴⁴ The only translations that merit serious consideration are “prayer” or “petition,” because the word sometimes appears with this latter meaning, but then mainly in relationships of subjects to rulers, as Bauer rightly observes.

Since the verb ἐντυγχάνω in 56:1 is used of an intercessory prayer to God,¹⁴⁵ it is possible that one should think of the prayer in 60:4, “Give concord and peace to us and to all that dwell on the earth” (δὸς ὁμόνοιαν καὶ εἰρήνην ἡμῖν τε καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν τὴν γῆν); but this is highly improbable. In any case, what is stated here is that the Corinthians must do something, that is, “root out the passion” (ἐκκόψητε τὴν ὀργήν) as a consequence of the ἐντευξις; what Clement does not say is “May God give you the strength . . .” But Clement’s relation to the Corinthians is not so humble that it would be correct to speak of a “petition,” such as a subject might address to a ruler. The word also appears in 2 Clem. 19:1, the oldest preserved Christian sermon: “I am reading you an exhortation to pay attention to that which is written” (ἀναγινώσκω ὑμῖν ἐντευξιν εἰς τὸ προσέχειν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις), where there is no talk of a “prayer.” Hence Bauernfeind rightly drops the elucidation “request” and gives for 2 Clem. 19:1 the rendering “Ansprache,” for our text, however, “Anliegen.” The lexicographer Hesychius gives for ἐντευξις the definition παράκλησις;¹⁴⁶ this is not a bad description of our letter. In Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *De Thucydide* 50, where there is discussion of an archaizing style of writing, it is observed that “they say this style is not suitable for an orator intending to address a popular audience, or for a litigant” (τοῖς μὲν πρὸς τὰς ὀχλικὰς ἐντεύξεις παρεσκευασμένοις καὶ τὰ δίκαια λέγουσιν), but is appropriate for those who are producing a work of history. Here the term ἐντευξις; has the meaning “exposition” or “address.” According to Philodemus, *Rhet.* IV, col. 41 (ed. S. Sudhaus I, p. 222), a certain Demetrius recognized in his classification of the rhetorical genres additionally an *enteuktikon*: εἰ μὲν λαμβάνει τὸν τοῖς πλήθεσιν ἐντευκτικὸν καὶ τὸν κατὰ πρεσβείαν τοῖς δυνάσταις. Insofar as I am able to ascertain, Demetrius’ classification met with no success in the rhetorical schools. But for our purposes this text is interesting, because it illustrates the bivalency of this ἐντευκτικός. Such

144 See the material in Liddell–Scott–Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 576; Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, 532; O. Bauernfeind in Kittel–Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch* (1969) Vol. 8, p. 244–45; G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962) 482.

145 The text runs as follows: καὶ ἡμεῖς ὄν ἐντύχωμεν περὶ τῶν ἐν τινὶ παραπτώματι ὑπαρχόντων. This is normal Greek usage; see the lexica, to which reference is made in the preceding note. For the use of ποιεῖσθαι + substantive as a circumlocution for the verbal idea in 63:2, see Liddell–Scott–Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 1428, II. 5; Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, 1354–55.

146 Hesychius, *Lexicon*, ed. M. Schmidt (Jena, 1858–1868,) s.v. ἐντευξις.

a discourse could be directed not only to the persons in authority, but also to the *πλήθος* (cf. also *ὁχλικός* in Dionysius of Halicarnassus). Such an exposition on “peace and concord” was given by the community of Rome to the *πλήθος* of Corinth (cf. 54:2).¹⁴⁷ But however one construes the meaning of the term, there is no evidence here of a consciousness of superiority.

Summary

In accordance with the indications which Clement himself provides, interpreted according to the linguistic usage of his time, 1 Clement belongs, according to its literary genre, to the *sumbouleutikon genos*, as recognized by ancient rhetoric. On this basis, certain characteristics of this writing and its “Sitz im Leben” may be explained.¹⁴⁸ On the occasion of the stasis which arose in the Christian community of Corinth, the community in Rome gives “counsel” by persuasion to return to “peace and concord.”

¹⁴⁷ On this use of *πλήθος*, see n. 136 above.

¹⁴⁸ The question of the structure and composition of 1 Clement can only be dealt with in the following study, after we have first established the relation of this letter to the Greek concept of ‘*homonoia*’.

An Interesting Document of Second Century Theological Discussion (Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. 1.10.3)

A statement on Christian theology in the second century made in 1875 by that giant in Patristic Studies Joseph Barber Lightfoot offers a good starting-point for this paper. In one of his “Essays on the work entitled Supernatural Religion”, that master-piece of sober, yet devastating criticism, he wrote: “The history of the first three quarters of the second century is necessarily obscure owing to the paucity of remains. A flood of light is suddenly poured in during the remaining years of the century.”¹ This verdict was given in a particular context, the acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel in that age, but that was just the particular situation which exemplified the more general rule. It was not a passing remark, but the terse expression of Lightfoot’s view based on the expert knowledge he possessed of this field.

Lightfoot wrote these words now a hundred years ago, standing at the threshold of a century which saw among many other great developments in scientific research a magnificent and unprecedented revival of patristic studies in England, France and particularly in Germany. We all know the names of the heroes on whose shoulders we stand, to use a familiar phrase which is the expression of the real situation, and remember in their company the great army of diligent workers in this field. Looking back to the days of the 1870’s we see an enormous change. Has history effaced Lightfoot’s words or do they still stand?

Great progress has been made; that is beyond dispute. Many new texts have been discovered, beginning with the *Didache*, followed by e.g. the *Apology* of Aristides, *The Odes of Solomon*, the *Homily* of Melito, many texts of the so-called *New Testament Apocrypha* and crowned by the marvellous library of Nag Hammadi; texts that had been in the hand of scholars for several centuries

1 J.B. Lightfoot, *Essays on the work entitled Supernatural Religion*² (London 1893) 53 (the Essays, collected in this book appeared in “The Contemporary Review” between 1874 and 1877; the quotation is found in the second Essay under the title “the Silence of Eusebius” of January 1875; for the history behind this work of Lightfoot see H. Chadwick, *The Vindication of Christianity in Westcott’s Thought* [Cambridge 1961] 20–23).—A verdict similar to that of Lightfoot is given about the same time by another great Patristic scholar, Theodor Zahn, *Acta Joannis* (Erlangen 1880) S. II: “war es der Wunsch und die Hoffnung, der kirchengeschichtlichen Forschung auf der *quellenarmen Strecke der Jahre 70–200* die eine oder andere . . . Quelle zu erschliessen” (italics are mine).

became better known. Excellent studies were written on these texts old and new. But is it not true that the new light brought by the new texts was accompanied by great shadows as well? The number of riddles and puzzles has also grown with the extent of knowledge. And can we say that the lament on the "paucity of remains" has been changed into the triumph-song of abundance? No, we see even more sharply the lack of information or the blank areas on the map. And notwithstanding the new discoveries the reading of the first five books of Eusebius' *Church History*, to mention only this, makes us fully aware how much is still lost. What was left is a fairly casual selection from different decades and localities, written with a special purpose in view and silent on many facts and factors, particularly about the religious life of the Christians. It is fair to say that the veil of obscurity that existed in the days Lightfoot wrote has been lifted in many ways and that great progress has been achieved; nonetheless we should always remind ourselves that darkness still reigns over large areas of that crucial second century.

In Lightfoot's view the obscurity was due to the paucity of remains. But is that true, was it even true in his days? The answer is: no! It was also owing to the fact that the existing remains had not sufficiently been examined and had not yielded the full evidence that is contained in it. And where are we now in this respect? Great progress has been made in retrieving the world in which the Christians of the 2nd century lived and confessed their faith, thanks to classical scholarship. Much clearer and more detailed information about the culture, philosophy and religious life of that time has become available. It greatly helps us to understand the expressions and reactions we read in these early documents. But has this material already fully been used in the interpretation? The answer is in the negative: too much, especially in the field of the "Dogmengeschichte" is seen as an autonomous Christian development and not as a development in a contemporary context in the full sense of the word, expressing the faith in that setting. With some notable examples from former times we must say that it was only the present generation after World-War II that took up this task in collaboration with and often guided by classical scholars; yet it is fair to confess that much work in this area is still left undone.

In connection with, but clearly apart from the reason mentioned in the previous paragraph stands another: the analysis and exegesis of the documents that remain, an "Auswertung" of that they do say, according to present-day standards and possibilities, are lacking. The Biblical scholar who is so well supplied with good commentaries is always painfully struck by the poor aids that are at his disposal when he is wrestling with the problems of the 2nd century. And I am firmly convinced that a good use of the existing documents in the light of our present knowledge can lift much of the obscurity. Every author

not only makes *explicit* statements, but gives also *implicit* information, which can be brought to light by careful analysis and comparison. The danger of asking too much lies in wait, but can be checked by severe self-criticism. At any rate a qualitative evaluation promises fruitful results which make the situation not so desperate as the quantitative paucity of remains seems to forebode. Let me illustrate this point from the *Shepherd* of Hermas. This seems at first sight a fairly dull document without much value, but studies like those of the late Erik Peterson and my pupil J. Reiling have shown, how much evidence can be gathered from it.² Along these lines not much progress has been made and a great task is still lying ahead of us. It is along this last line that I will try in this paper to dispel some of the darkness by which a good deal of the 2nd century before Irenaeus is still enwrapped in spite of all the work done in the century that elapsed since Lightfoot penned the sentences from which we started.

The passage under discussion, Irenaeus, *A.H.* 1, 10,3 (for the text, see Appendix, p. 334f.), is a very curious piece of information, a list of theological questions, which are enumerated without further discussion. It attracts our attention, because it is so different from the subject-matter in this book and falls as it were out of its setting.

The "Refutation of the Gnosis falsely so called" in its present form of five books gradually took shape³ and each volume was preceded by a preface in which the author gives account of his plan. Irenaeus follows here a custom, which we find in many ancient authors, though his prefaces are rather remarkable for their relative length. In the Preface to Book II he gives a summary of the previous book. Some sentences from this summary may be quoted,⁴ because they form a table of contents: "I showed . . . that the whole system devised in many and opposite ways, by those who are of the school of Valentinus, was false and baseless. I also set forth the tenets of their predecessors, proving that they not only differed among themselves, but had long previously swerved from the truth itself. I further explained, with all diligence, the doctrine as well as the practice of Marcus the magician, since he too belongs to these persons;

2 See the important articles of E. Peterson, in his collected papers: *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* (Freiburg i. Br. 1959) 254–332; J. Reiling, *Hermas and Christian Prophecy, a study of the eleventh Mandate* (Leiden 1973).

3 O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*² (Freiburg i. Br. 1913) I, 404 ff.

4 The translation followed in this paper is that of A. Roberts – W.H. Rambaut, in the *Ante-nicene Christian Library*, vol. V and IX.—The text is that of W.W. Harvey, *Sancti Irenaei . . . Libros quinque adversus Haereses* (Cantabrigiae 1857) 2 vols.; the numbering of chapters and paragraphs is according to the editions of R. Massuet and W. Stieren.—The Greek text of *A.H.* 1, 10,3 as given in the Appendix has been preserved by Epiphanius, *Panarion* 31, 31,5–12 (ed. K. Holl, I, 433 f.); it is so printed that the structure becomes apparent.

and I carefully noticed the passages which they garble from the Scriptures, with the view of adapting them to their own fictions . . . declaring at the same time the doctrine of Simon Magus of Samaria, their progenitor, and of all those who succeeded him. I mentioned too the multitude of those Gnostics who are sprung from him, and noticed the points of difference between them, their several doctrines, and the order of their succession." This outline is fairly accurate: the ch. 1–8 doctrines of the Valentinian Ptolemaeus; ch. 11–12 those of Valentinus, Secundus, disciples of Ptolemaeus and other anonymous teachers; ch. 13–17 Marcus Magus; ch. 18–20 perverted passages from Scripture; ch. 21 gnostic teachings of redemption, ch. 22–23 a survey of a long array of heretical teachings in the form of a doxography. In between this collection of gnostic material from different origin stand ch. 9 refutation of gnostic methods in using Scripture; ch. 10 the unity of faith as confessed by the church in the whole world opposite to the diversity of the heretical schools, and ch. 22 the one *regula fidei* of the church from which the heresies that will be described have deviated. These chapters are not mentioned in the summary of Book II *praef.* and stand quite apart from the rest of Book I. Irenaeus' plan was clearly devised and executed accordingly: the first book offers the relevant material to show what the Gnostics taught; the following four books contain the refutation along different lines of attack. He got his information from gnostic books and former adherents, and he was rather proud that he could give such an accurate account, because it gave him an advantage over his predecessors who were, according to his own judgement, "unable . . . to refute the Valentinians satisfactorily, because they were ignorant of these men's system" (IV, *praef.* 2). And every student of Gnosticism thanks the church-father for it, because notwithstanding our thirst for more complete information we cannot but acknowledge how much we owe to him and how precise his information is as far as it goes.

In focussing now our attention on ch. 10 we see that it is a kind of excursus. It stands as it were between brackets which are formed by ch. 9, 5: "we have judged it well to point out, first of all, in what respects the very fathers of this fable differ among themselves, as if they were inspired by different spirits of error. For this very fact forms *a priori* proof that the truth proclaimed by the church is immovable, and that the theories of these men are but a tissue of falsehood," and ch. 11, 1: "Let us now look at the inconsistent opinions of those heretics . . ., how they do not agree in treating the same points, but alike, in things and names, set forth opinions mutually discordant."⁵

5 See also *A.H.* 1, 21,5–22,1: "But since they differ so widely among themselves both as respects doctrine and traditions and since those of them who are recognised as being most modern

Between these brackets, in sharp contrast with this variety of opinions Irenaeus pictures the unity of the church in its confession. There was every reason to find variety here as well, because, as is strongly stressed, the church is scattered throughout the whole world and the languages are dissimilar. And yet there a wonderful unity is found.⁶—It would take us too far, if we were to discuss this form of argument; let it be sufficient for the moment to state that in certain circles in Antiquity “unison” was a clear witness to the truth, whereas variety of opinion on the same matter was a sign of confusion, ignorance and falsehood.⁷ Irenaeus, we may say, uses here the christian variant of the *argumentum e consensu gentium*, and was sure that his readers would accept it and be convinced.

In what does this harmony consist? “The church, though dispersed throughout the whole world . . . has received from the apostles and their disciples this faith (παρὰ δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν ἐκείνων μαθητῶν παραλαβούσα τὴν . . . πίστιν) and then follows a fairly long text of the Creed⁸ which is remarkable since it is trinitarian, the Holy Spirit being the Spirit of prophecy foretelling Jesus’ destiny in past, present and future, and lays a strong emphasis on the coming judgment. We can leave this credal form undiscussed in the present context. But with regard to the origin of the faith mentioned here we must remind ourselves that for Irenaeus it was a very vivid one, viz., Apostle=John, disciple=Polycarp, his own teacher.⁹

In the next paragraph the opening sentence is taken up again: “the church, having received this preaching and this faith (τοῦτο τὸ κήρυγμα παρεληφύα καὶ τὴν πίστιν), although scattered throughout the whole world, yet . . . carefully preserves it. She also believes these points (of doctrine) . . . and she proclaims them and teaches them and hands them down, with perfect harmony” (ἐπιμελῶς φυλάσσει . . . ὁμοίως πιστεύει τούτοις . . . ταῦτα κηρύσσει, καὶ διδάσκει καὶ παραδίδωσιν).

make it their effort daily to invent some new opinion, and to bring out what no one ever before thought of, it is a difficult matter to describe all their opinions”; 22,1: “The rule of faith which we hold, is, . . . Holding, therefore, this rule, we shall easily show, notwithstanding the great variety and multitude of their opinions, that these men have deviated from the truth.”

6 I hope to discuss this in a paper, entitled: *The Wonder of the Church in Irenaeus*.

7 A full treatment of this argument must be postponed at the moment, but will be the theme of a special essay.

8 Cf. A.H. 1, 9,4 οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὁ τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας ἀκλινῇ ἐν ἑαυτῷ κατέχων, ὃν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἴληφε.

9 See my forthcoming article: *The Authority of the Presbyters in Irenaeus*.—For this credal form of Irenaeus, see J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*³ (London 1972) 76 ff.

Irenaeus mentions the churches in different parts of the world, North–West–East–South and “in the central regions of the world”: everywhere the meaning of this transmitted faith (ἡ δύναμις τῆς παραδόσεως) is one and the same. The preaching of the truth (τὸ κήρυγμα τῆς ἀληθείας) is compared with the sun, the creature of God that shines everywhere, “and enlightens all men that are willing to come to a knowledge of the truth” (τοὺς βουλομένους εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν).¹⁰

So far so good: in contrast to the variety of gnostic teaching stands the one simple Creed, received from the Apostles and their disciples, not newly invented like the tenets of the heretics.¹¹ This is all clear and can be understood from the need of Irenaeus and his readers to have some moment of pause, a place of safe rest amidst the whirlpools of gnostic ideas and sounds.

But Irenaeus has something to add, and makes the situation more concrete. In the clash of this strife one has not to do with teachings in books, but with men of flesh and blood, with living voices setting forth the truth. The transmission of the faith (*paradosis*) was not a matter of playing always the same record—to put it anachronistically—nor were the spokesmen of the church mere parrots. We know of philosophers like Justin Martyr who continued their teaching after conversion, and from the very beginning there had been men of great eloquence like Apollos.¹² But not all leading men (οἱ προεστῶτες¹³) had these gifts; Irenaeus excuses himself for his lack of elegant speech (*A.H.* I, *praef.* 3). It is well-known how highly oratory was valued in the ancient world. So the question arises: What is its effect on this Rule of Faith? Is its validity changed by abundance or paucity of words? The answer is quite clear: “Nor will any one of the rulers in the churches, however highly gifted he may be in point of eloquence (ὁ παντὶ δυνατὸς ἐν λόγῳ), teach doctrines different from these (for no one is greater than the Master¹⁴), nor, on the other hand, will he who is deficient in power of expression (ὁ ἀσθενὴς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ) inflict injury on the tradition. For the faith being ever one and the same, neither does one who is able at

10 Cf. 1 Timothy 2,4 (but there used of God as willing).

11 Cf. *A.H.* I, 18,1: “And while they affirm such things as these concerning the creation, every one of them generates something new, day by day, according to his ability. No one is deemed ‘perfect’, who does not develop among them some mighty fictions”; and I, 21,5 (see before nt. 5).

12 Justin Martyr: Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 4, 11,11—Apollos: Acts 18,24.

13 See H.G. Liddell – R. Scott – H.S. Jones, *A Greek–English Lexicon*⁹ (Oxford 1940) 1482 g.; W. Bauer, *Griechisch–deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*⁵ (Berlin 1958) 1402.

14 Cf. Matth. 10,24; Luc. 6,40.

great length to discourse regarding it (ὁ πολὺ περὶ αὐτῆς δυνάμενος εἰπεῖν) make any addition to it, nor does one who can say but little (ὁ τὸ ὀλίγον), diminish it.” The use of the aorists ἐπλεόνασε—ἡλαττόνησε is striking. Harvey referred to the text in Exod. 16,18 LXX where the same words are found in the history of the Israelites who had gathered the manna.¹⁵ It may be that Irenaeus had this story in mind; typology opened the door to many, often unsuspected, possibilities. But Roberts and Klebba¹⁶ in their translations took it for a gnomic aorist,¹⁷ and this seems correct, for there is not the slightest indication here that points in the direction of Exod. 16, whereas the terminology employed is a variation of a form of speech, well-known to Irenaeus and his contemporaries: the combination “not to add to, not to diminish from” is a mark that the integrity of something is safe-guarded, that it is inviolable and sacrosanct.¹⁸ In other words: the christian faith as received from the apostles being always one and the same cannot in any way be changed by man’s eloquence or parsimony of words.

In this way Irenaeus has stated the origin, contents, universality and inviolability of the Creed, the same in different countries, languages and human capacities of expression. This identity of the christian faith and preaching is in contrast with, and at the same time condemns, the diverse and fanciful views of the Gnostics, which have been reproduced in the previous chapters and which will be surveyed later. But before returning to the main task Irenaeus has set himself in this book, he adds yet another paragraph, which both for its structure and contents is remarkable. It seems as though it falls out of the context and has only a very slight connection with the point Irenaeus is making. So it makes us wonder why it stands here and what it has to tell us.

The connection with the preceding paragraph cannot but be called very slight: in the words τὸ δὲ πλεῖον ἢ ἡλαττον a link is found with the preceding verbs ἐπλεόνασεν, ἡλαττόνησε, but in reading through the lines of this paragraph it is not clear what this “more or less” exactly means. The word “more” may be explained by verbs like παρεπινοεῖν and προσεπεξεργάζεσθαι, but for the word “less” there is hardly any reason. It is a matter of course that they are the objects of κατὰ σύνεσιν εἰδέναι τινάς. The translation offered by Robertson: “because

15 Harvey, *o.c.*, I, 94, *in margine*.—The text of Exod. 16,18 LXX reads as follows: καὶ μετρήσαντες τῷ γομορ οὐκ ἐπλεόνασεν ὁ τὸ πολὺ, καὶ ὁ τὸ ἡλαττον οὐκ ἡλαττόνησεν.

16 Roberts in his translation, see above, nt. 4; E. Klebba, *Des heiligen Irenäus fünf Bücher gegen die Häresien*, Bibliothek der Kirchenväter (Kempten–München 1912) I, 34.

17 F. Blass – A. Debrunner – R.W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian literature* (Cambridge 1961) § 333.

18 See my article: De la règle Μῆτε προσθεῖναι μῆτε ἀφελεῖν dans l’histoire du Canon, *Vigiliae Christianae* 3 (1949) 1 ff.

men are endowed with greater and less degrees of intelligence", is not correct; it should be: "the fact that some people know more or less by insight." Of course these persons he has in view are teachers, because the line of thought in the preceding paragraph is continued; this interpretation is confirmed by the end of the passage, where the argument is rounded off: the contract between the one God of the Christian faith and the various divine Ideas beyond the creator, "as those teachers who are truly destitute of divine insight maintain" (ὡς λέγουσιν οὗτοι οἱ ἀληθῶς ἔρημοι θείας συνέσεως διδάσκαλοι).¹⁹

Irenaeus knows not only church leaders who are very eloquent, while others are poor in speech, but also those who have a sharper mind than others. With this latter group he is dealing in this passage. Where will that lead to?

He had found in his neighbourhood disciples of Marcus Gnosticus who proclaimed "themselves as being 'perfect' so that no one can be compared to them with respect to the immensity of their knowledge, nor even were you to mention Paul or Peter and any other of the apostles. They assert that they themselves know more than all others, and that they alone have imbibed the greatness of that power which is unspeakable" (A.H. 1, 13,6). In another passage (A.H. 2, 26,1) he attacks those people who call themselves 'perfect', with these words: "it is therefore better and more profitable to belong to the simple and unlettered class (ιδιώτας καὶ ὀλιγομαθεῖς), and by means of love to attain to nearness to God, then, by imagining ourselves learned and skilful (πολυμαθεῖς καὶ ἐμπείρους), to be found (among those who are) blasphemous against their own God, in as much as they conjure up (*fabricantes*) another God as the Father"; with an appeal to Paul's saying: "Knowledge puffeth up, but love edifieth" (1 Cor. 8,1) he distinguishes between true and false knowledge.

In view of these possibilities the question arises in which way this sharp wit will express itself. Is it necessary to make a *sacrificium intellectus* in order to avoid the dangers of these gnostic teachers? If not, how will these intellectual exercises affect the Rule of Faith, held by the universal Church? It is interesting to see—first of all—that Irenaeus devotes much more space to this point than to the differences in eloquence and their effect. If we count the lines in Harvey's edition, it appears that to eloquence 6 lines are given and to the present question no less than 38 lines. What is the reason for this discrepancy? The obvious answer is: because Irenaeus attached such weight to this point of man's insight (*synesis*) with regard to the faith. This is correct, but does not explain everything, because we make here another observation.

This paragraph is not only striking for its length, but also for its structure, both in division of the subject-matter and in syntax. As to the first point we

19 Here and in some other places the translation of Roberts has been changed in order to bring out what is in my opinion the correct interpretation.

notice that Irenaeus gives twice an indication of what should not be the direction in which the *synesis* may go, *viz.*, at the beginning and at the end, a signal being the repetition of the verb *παρεπινοεῖν* = “to conceive besides . . .” Irenaeus does not repeat the whole phrase, but there is a clear parallelism in thought. Besides that it is clear that in the final clause beginning with *ἀλλὰ οὐκ* he takes up the beginning again; for as it stands this sentence is strictly speaking an ellipsis without subject or main verb; its contents *ἐν τῷ . . . παρεπινοεῖν* is dependent upon the beginning of the paragraph *γίνεται* and stands parallel to *ἐν τῷ . . . ἀλλάσσειν* κτλ. But in between these parallel sentences stands a long passage, consisting of infinitives, which syntactically speaking also depend on that same main verb *γίνεται ἐν τῷ* and are combined with more than ten indirect questions (one *ὅτι*). This inserted passage has a typical structure of parallelism in construction, stands apart from Irenaeus’ usual way of writing in this passage, and is closed by the quotation of Paul’s words in Romans 11,33: “O depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments and how inscrutable his ways!” After this ejaculation of wonder Irenaeus turns back to the beginning.

Of this whole paragraph beginning and end have directly to do, as we shall see presently, with the controversy with the Gnostics and with the point at issue, the faith of the church. But the intervening sentences or rather questions are not directly connected with it. What is the reason and character of this long insertion? In his train of thought Irenaeus would have reached his goal, had he stopped after *ὑποθέσει*, or, if required, after *ἐκδιηγείσθαι*. He must have felt himself that this was an intersection, because after the words of Paul he returns to the matter in hand and brings it to a close. One cannot say that he let himself go, is carried forward by a certain enthusiasm, for the whole composition is too well-balanced and is carefully made up.

Houssiau called this passage a description of the task of a theologian.²⁰ But that is a rather formal definition. If this were Irenaeus’ purpose, it is strange that he closes his list with the words “and others of like nature” (*ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμοίων αὐτοῖς*), which sound a little negligent. Bengsch in his important book on Irenaeus’ theology²¹ has seen the remarkable break and thinks that not sufficient attention has been given to it. According to him “nennt Irenaeus eine Reihe . . . Themata, mit denen sich das theologische Denken befassen soll”; they form a series of *obiter dicta*, but characteristic examples of the direction

20 A. Houssiau, *La Christologie de Saint Irénée* (Louvain–Gembloux 1955) 100.

21 A. Bengsch, *Heilsgeschichte und Heilswissen, eine Untersuchung zur Struktur und Entfaltung des theologischen Denkens im Werk “Adversus Haereses” des hl. Irenäus von Lyon* (Leipzig 1957) 51 ff.

in which his theology on the basis (“Grundlage” = ὑπόθεσις) moves; they show questions characteristic “für einen heilsgeschichtlich denkenden Theologen”.²² In this perspective of “Heilsgeschichte” Bengsch sees the order of these questions: “das Verständnis der *einen* Heilsordnung mit ihren verschiedenen Anordnungen” and “Die Fragen des Irenäus zielen auf eine Sinnerschliessung und Erläuterung des Heilsgeschehens”,²³ for he asks: why? This is in sharp contrast with the questions the Gnostics put: “Who we were; what we became?” etc., the famous list, given by Clement of Alexandria, *Exc. ex Theodoto* 78,2.²⁴

Another line was followed in the beginning of this century by Kattenbusch; he was particularly interested in the relation between these questions and the *Regula Fidei*: “Er (sc. Irenaeus) führt eine ganze Anzahl Themata auf, die diese *Gelehrten* bearbeiten. Man kann hier sehen, was ihm “Theologie” ist im Unterschied von der Religion, γνῶσις im Unterschied von der πίστις”;²⁵ the question whether there was a certain tradition behind it or not is hard to decide. In view of these conflicting evaluations a fresh examination of this text, remarkable both for its place and formal characteristics, may not be unwelcome.

The first point Irenaeus is making has to do with the ὑπόθεσις which may not be changed, to which the parables must be adapted (οἰκειοῦν). What is meant by this word? Roberts offers two different translations, viz., “subject-matter (of the faith)” and “general scheme”. Bengsch translates it by “Grundlage”. This noun has a great variety of meanings in Greek, as the philosopher Sextus Empiricus (*Adv. Math.* 3, 3) reminded his readers. Irenaeus uses it many times in the preceding chapters of his book, also in connection with the Gnostics. Two examples may illustrate his usage. After having given an *exposé* of the drama of Fall and Restoration as taught by his opponents he says: τοιαύτης δὲ τῆς ὑποθέσεως αὐτῶν οὐσης, “which neither the prophets announced, nor the Lord taught, nor the apostles transmitted” (1, 8,1); in another place he blames the Gnostics in those words: “wrestling from the truth every one of the expressions which have been cited, and misusing the names” εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν ὑπόθεσιν μετήνεγκαν (1, 9,2), that is: they took these expressions out of their proper setting and transferred them to another context; for this procedure Irenaeus has a nice comparison which he uses twice (1, 8,1. 9,4): gems which formed the portrait of a king are

22 Bengsch, *o.c.*, 53 f.

23 Bengsch, *o.c.*, 55.

24 Bengsch, *o.c.*, 55.

25 F. Kattenbusch, *Das apostolische Symbol* (Leipzig 1900) II, *Verbreitung und Bedeutung des Taufsymbols*, 36.

so rearranged that the image of a fox appears.²⁶ Kattenbusch has perfectly well understood the meaning of ὑπόθεσις in using the Latin *argumentum*;²⁷ this interpretation is in accordance with the first explanation given by Sextus Empiricus. It was used in Greek for the plot of a play, a brief *résumé* of a drama or oration.²⁸ Over against this *hypothesis* of the Gnostics stands that of the Church, as given in the outline Irenaeus has offered in 1, 10,1. That is radically changed, if another God is conceived beyond the Creator. In the gnostic myth, as reproduced in the preceding chapters that is clearly the case, and it is *the* great theme of Irenaeus' refutation to attack this differentiation and to maintain the unity of the highest God with the Creator. One text out of many that can be gleaned from the *Adversus Haereses* may be sufficient to illustrate this: *Blasphemant enim fabricatorem, hoc est eum, qui est vere Deus . . .; putantes se super Deum alterum invenisse Deum vel alteram Plenitudinem* (3, 24,2). As for the words "another Christ or another Monogenes" see 1, 9,2 where Irenaeus exposes the gnostic interpretation of the Prologue of St. John's Gospel: (the Gnostics) "perverting these statements, maintain that there was another Monogenes, according to production . . . that there was another Saviour, and another Logos, the son of Monogenes, and another Christ produced for the re-establishment of the Pleroma." In making these distinctions the whole drama of salvation is of course unsettled.

This way being barred—and, as was pointed out before, this rejection is repeated at the end of this paragraph by mentioning some other elements of that same gnostic *hypothesis* which had been set forth in *A.H.* 1, 1 and 2, and

26 Another example given by Irenaeus is that of a *cento* of Homeric verses which sounds most impressive, but is made from verses taken out of their context and thereby twisted in their meaning.

27 Kattenbusch, *o.c.*, 30 f.

28 Liddell-Scott-Jones, *o.c.*, 1882. Some other texts where Irenaeus uses the word may be quoted here: *A.H.* 1, 4,4 ἐντεῦθεν δὴ κατὰ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν αὐτῶν ὑπολαμβάνειν δεῖ—ἀρμόζουσι γὰρ τοιοῦτοι καρποὶ τῇ ὑπόθεσιν αὐτῶν.—9,2 κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκείνων ὑπόθεσιν οὐχ ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο.—9,3 ταύτης δὲ λελυμένης, διαπέπτωκεν αὐτῶν πᾶσα ἡ ὑπόθεσις, ἣν ψευδῶς ὀνειρώττοντες κατατρέχουσι τῶν γραφῶν, ἰδίαν ὑπόθεσιν ἀναπλάσασμενοι. . . 9,4 ὅμοια ποιοῦντες τοῖς ὑποθέσεις τὰς τυχούσας αὐτοῖς προβαλλομένοις . . . ὥστε τοὺς ἀπειροτέρους δοκεῖν ἐπ' ἐκείνης τῆς ἐξ ὑπογίου μεμελετημένης ὑποθέσεως "Ὀμηρον τὰ ἔπη πεποιηκέναι.—καὶ νομίσαιεν οὕτως αὐτὰ "Ὀμηρον ἐπὶ ταύτης ὑποθέσεως πεποιηκέναι; ὁ δ' ἔμπειρος τῆς Ὀμηρικῆς ὑποθέσεως ἐπιγνώσεται—ἄρας δὲ αὐτὰ, καὶ ἐν ἑκαστον ἀποδοὺς τῇ ἰδίᾳ, ἐκποδῶν ποιήσει τὴν ὑπόθεσιν—τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν ὀνόματα, καὶ τὰς λέξεις, καὶ τὰς παραβολὰς ἐπιγνώσεται, τὴν δὲ βλάσφημον ὑπόθεσιν ταύτην οὐκ ἐπιγνώσεται.—For a very full discussion of the word ὑπόθεσις see W. Trimpi, *The Ancient Hypothesis of Fiction: an Essay on the Origins of Literary Theory, Traditio* 27 (1971) 1–78.

elsewhere—, Irenaeus directs the attention to the right way. He gives pride of place to “parables”. Why? The answer is found in 1, 3,1: “the Gnostics tell us, however, that this knowledge has not been openly divulged, because all are not capable of receiving it, but has been mystically revealed (μεμηνῦσθαι) by the Saviour through means of parables to those qualified for understanding them” (τοῖς συνιεῖν δυναμένοις); in the next paragraphs examples of their wrong exegesis are put before the reader (others are to follow in ch. 8²⁹). Irenaeus brings that report to a close by these words: “Such, then, is the account which they all give of their Pleroma and of the formation of the universe, striving, as they do, to adapt the good words of revelation to their own wicked inventions,” in this way they treat not only the gospels and apostolic writings, but also Law and Prophets “which contain many parables and allegories that can frequently be drawn into various senses, according to the kind of exegesis to which they are subjected” (1, 3,6). This is an important point, because by this use of the parables the simple people are deceived (1, 8,1). Therefore Irenaeus returns to this use of Scripture several times, see e.g. *A.H.* 2, 10,2: “these people, while striving to explain passages of Scripture and parables, bring forward another more important, and indeed impious question, to this effect, ‘Whether there be really another God above that God who was the creator of the world?’” They make the mistake of trying to explain one ambiguity by means of another ambiguity in stead of looking for a solution “from those which are manifest, and evident and clear” (2, 10,1). Making the same point again in 2, 27 he says explicitly: “the entire Scriptures, the prophets and the Gospels, can be clearly, unambiguously and harmoniously understood by all, although all do not believe them.” Since then the Gnostics laid so much stress on the use of parables containing a hidden meaning and treated the Scriptures also in their historical parts as though they were parables, Irenaeus broaches this subject first.

What should be done? In the first place it is necessary “to investigate more perfectly”,³⁰ what is expressed in the parables and “adapt”³¹ it to the “argument” (cf. before) of the Faith, *i.e.* to read the parables in line with and as

29 See *A.H.* 1, 8,1: “In like manner do these persons patch together old wives’ fables and then endeavour, by violently drawing away from their proper connection words, expressions, and parables whenever found, to adapt the oracles of God to their baseless fictions.”

30 A. Stieren, *Sancti Irenaei . . . contra omnes Haereses libri quinque* (Lipsiae 1853) I, 979: “exquirere, accurate pertractare, accurate explicare.”—W.W. Harvey, *o.c.*, I, 95, nt. 1: “*working out the truth from the figurative, as well as from the plain portions of Scripture.*”—Both these editions read here προσπεργάζεσθαι. That verb is not found in Liddell–Scott–Jones, *o.c.*; I follow here the reading of K. Holl. See Liddell–Scott–Jones, *o.c.*, 1509 s.v. “complete still more perfectly”; for the simple ἐπεξεργάζεσθαι, *o.c.*, 617 “investigate”.

31 See Liddell–Scott–Jones, *o.c.*, 1721 s.v.

an illustration of the Gospel, and not of the gnostic myth. In the second place “to tell in detail” τὴν πραγματείαν καὶ οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ ἀνθρωπότητι γενομένην. The meaning and great importance, attached to the word οἰκονομία by Irenaeus is well-known;³² it is God’s “dispensation”. The πραγματεία is the “activity”, cf. *A.H.* 3, 11,8, where the four Cherubs are called the images of the πραγματεία of the Son of God.³³ These words *oikonomia* and *pragmateia* together form an *hendiadys*: the working of God’s saving activity. Irenaeus adds to this a more specifying clause: τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ ἀνθρωπότητι γενομένην. The exact translation of the preposition ἐπὶ may be somewhat doubtful; has it a local meaning or is it “in view of”? In any case it is evident that all emphasis lies on the word “humanity”. This addition is made for good reasons. The Gnostics spoke of an “activity” inside or outside the Pleroma, one that had to do with the Aeons (see the texts in note 33), in the upper world, but not in ours. For Irenaeus it is essential that God’s saving activity takes place in this world, on behalf of human beings, fallen sinners.

Then follows that long insertion with its list of twelve verbs after indirect questions (the first ὅτι should not be translated by “that”, but taken in line with the following lines as ὅ τι = “wherefore”³⁴). All these sentences are not an exemplification of the preceding text, but all depend on the words ἐν τῷ in the beginning and stand more or less parallel with ἐκδιηγείσθαι (for this verb see *A.H.* 5, 6,1: the brethren in the church with charismatic powers τὰ μυστήρια τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκδιηγούμενων). The verbs denote various activities, but it is impossible to discover a climax in this series. It does not start with discovery, followed by understanding and proclamation, but the verbs are used as synonyms and promiscuously. I wonder if Bengsch was fully correct in saying that they express “Verkündigung” (proclamation) in contrast with speculation.³⁵ Irenaeus wants to bring out in this variety of verbs that the answer to these questions must be searched out, explained and made public: σαφηνίζειν = to make clear;³⁶

32 A. Benoit, *Saint Irénée, introduction à l’étude de sa théologie* (Paris 1960) 192; A. Bengsch, *o.c.*, passim; cf. also G.W.H. Lampe (ed.), *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford 1961–1968) 940 ff.

33 See also *A.H.* 1, 3,1 αὕτη μὲν οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντὸς Πληρώματος ὑπ’ αὐτῶν λεγομένη πραγματεία—1, 8,2 καὶ δι’ αὐτοῦ (sc. Jesus) τοῦ τέλους ἐμφάνη τὸ τέλος τῆς περὶ τοὺς Αἰῶνας πραγματείας—1, 11,1 out of Anthropos and Ecclesia there originated twelve Aeons ὧν μίαν ἀποστάσαν καὶ ὑστερήσαν τὴν λοιπὴν πραγματείαν πεποιήσθαι—1, 18,1 ὁ γὰρ Μωϋσῆς, φασί—, ἀρχόμενος τῆς κατὰ τὴν κτίσιν πραγματείας—; cf. in the same passage *A.H.* 3, 11,8 two more examples.

34 Liddell–Scott–Jones, *o.c.*, 1265, s.v. ὅ τι.

35 A. Bengsch, *o.c.*, 55, nt. 1.

36 Cf. *A.H.* 3, 11,8 Fourth Gospel = eagle, τὸν τοῦ πνεύματος ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐφιπταμένον δόσιν σαφηνίζον.

ἀπαγγέλλειν = to explain,³⁷ to make known; συνιέν = to understand; μηνύειν = to indicate (this verb is used very frequently in the preceding chapters, also in connection with gnostic teachings); διδάσκειν = to teach; κηρύσσειν = to preach (cf. 1, 8, 1: ἦν οὕτε Προφήται ἐκηρύξαν, οὕτε ὁ Κύριος ἐδίδαξεν); ἐξερευνᾶν = to search out; μὴ σιωπᾶν = not to conceal, of course a *litotes*; διαγγέλλειν = to make known. Two verbs we have not yet mentioned in this list, because they must receive special note: a) ἀναπτύσσειν = to unfold, in a concrete sense of a book-roll, and also in a more general sense to disclose; in connection with the prophecies contained in the Scriptures it was very aptly chosen by Irenaeus;³⁸ b) εὐχαριστεῖν = to give thanks; it is somewhat odd after the question διὰ τί and in this series; Roberts admits this fact, but he thinks it may be rendered as “gratefully describe”;³⁹ so far, however, no example of such a usage have been discovered; Billius (1585) already was suspicious about it, but nevertheless the editors continue to print it in their texts, the more so because it stands in Epiphanius and in the Old Latin version *gratias agere*. Harvey found it “difficult to make a satisfactory sense with this word” and suspected an old corruption; he suggested to read παριστᾶν = to set before the mind,⁴⁰ but that seems to be somewhat far-fetched. Since the text is corrupt for the reasons mentioned before, my conjecture is that the correct reading must have been: (ἀν)ευρίσκειν = to find out, which is in line with the rest and not too far away from the transmitted text.⁴¹

Let us now have a look at the various specific items which Irenaeus brings forward and see what light is shed on them by other texts of this author:

1) *God's longsuffering with regard to the apostasy of angels and the disobedience of men.*—The first point is also mentioned in *A.H.* 5, 29, 2: “all the commixture of wickedness which took place previous to the deluge, due to the apostasy of the angels.” Here Irenaeus refers to Genesis 6, 2 “the sons of God (LXX ἄγγελοι) saw that the daughters of men were fair; and they took to wife such of them as they chose”; this interpretation of “sons of God” by “angels” was very well-known and widespread in later Judaism and early Christendom

37 Liddell–Scott–Jones, *o.c.*, 174, s.v.

38 Liddell–Scott–Jones, *o.c.*, 118, s.v.

39 A. Roberts, *o.c.*, 44 nt. 3; Lampe, *Lexicon*, 579, s.v. “consider with gratitude”; but he gives one single reference to support this sense, and that is . . . precisely this text of Irenaeus.

40 Stieren, *o.c.*, I, 124, nt. c; II, 611, and Harvey, *o.c.*, I, 96, nt. 2.

41 The corruption can easily be explained, since Incarnation and Passion were so central in the Eucharist.

since 1 Enoch 6, 1 ff.⁴² In connection with this text of Irenaeus it is interesting to see, how much attention is paid to it by Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 2, 5,3 f. As to the second point see *A.H.* 5, 23,1–2, where Irenaeus says: “disobedience to God entails death”; there the story of Gen. 3 is treated under the aspect of men’s lying before God. See also the story of the Fall in *Dem.* 16. But we notice that the magnanimity of God is not dealt with in that connection. The question here in *A.H.* 1, 10,3 is that God did not destroy the fallen angels and men, but suffered them to live on for centuries; why this magnanimity? In other places (e.g. *A.H.* 3, 20,2. 23,1; 4, 37,7 *Deo quidem magnanimitatem praestante in apostasia hominis*) Irenaeus deals with this concept of longsuffering; but then neither Gen. 3 nor Gen. 6 are referred to. He states and shows there the fact, that God is longsuffering, but there is no answer to the question, why?

2) *The creation of all things by one God.*—It is superfluous to mention every text where Irenaeus speaks of the one God Creator because this is the ever-recurring theme in his polemics against the Gnostics and Marcion. Cf. *A.H.* 1, 22,1: *omnia per ipsum fecit Pater, sive visibilia, sive invisibilia, sive sensibilia, sive intelligibilia, sive temporalia . . . sive sempiterna et aeterna, non per angelos, neque per virtutes . . . ; nihil enim indiget omnium Deus, sed et per Verbum et Spiritum suum omnia faciens et disponens et gubernans et omnibus esse praestans*, which is an explication of the words *unus Deus omnipotens*; see also *A.H.* 4, 5,1 *Unus igitur et idem Deus . . . qui temporalia fecit propter hominem*,⁴³ *ut maturescens in eis fructificet immortalitatem, et qui aeterna superducit propter suam benignitatem*, followed by the quotation of Eph. 2,7.—This description of the creation “some things temporal, eternal etc.” is a rather typical formulation, because it is far more usual, also in Irenaeus, to speak of God as the Creator of “heaven and earth”.⁴⁴ In Col. 1,16 “things visible and invisible” are mentioned in connection with creation, quoted by Irenaeus in *A.H.* 1, 4,5 (in a gnostic context).⁴⁵ But the extensive formula used here is not found. The question is of course, how it is possible that one and the same God has made these things so different in quality; but an answer is not found elsewhere in Irenaeus’ works.

42 See the references of R.H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford 1913) II, 191 ad Enoch 6, 2 and also Irenaeus, *Demonstr.* 18.

43 T.W. Manson, *Mark ii. 27 f.*, in *Coniectanea Neotestamentica XI in honorem Antonii Fridrichsen* (Lund–Copenhagen 1947) 143 ff. on the question in whose interest the world was created, according to Jewish and early Christian conceptions.

44 Cf. A. Harnack, *Anhang*, in: A. Hahn – G.L. Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der Alten Kirche*³ (Breslau 1897) 372; Kattenbusch, *o.c.*, 875 ff.

45 The text of Col. 1, 16 is frequently quoted in the early Church, cf. the references in *Biblia Patristica, index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique*, ed. du centre d’analyse et de documentation patristiques (Paris 1975) 503.

3) *The invisible God manifesting Himself to the prophets in different forms.*—The conception that God is invisible, is widespread in early Christendom. The words of Exod. 33,20: “No man shall see God and live,” had made a deep impression. We may recall texts like Joh. 1,18; Col. 1,15; 1 Tim. 1,17. 6,16; 2 Clem. 20,5; *Kerygma Petr.* fr. 2; Athenagoras, *Suppl.* 10,1; *Epist. ad Diognet.* 7,2, etc.; ἄρατος is a regular epithet of God, and the Christians shared it with many of their pagan contemporaries.⁴⁶ In *A.H.* 4, 20,4–11 Irenaeus deals very extensively with the topic of the vision of God by the prophets. His starting-point is “the Word foretelling from the beginning that God should be seen by man” (20,4). He continues in par. 5 by saying: “These things did the prophets set forth in a prophetic manner; but they did not, as some allege, (proclaim) that He who was seen by the prophets was a different (God), the Father of all being invisible. Yet this is what those (heretics) declare, who are altogether ignorant of the nature of prophecy.” Irenaeus explains the way in which man shall see God, for: “the prophets, therefore, did not openly behold the actual face of God, but (they saw) the dispensations and the mysteries through which man should afterwards see God” (par. 10). In his usual way Irenaeus dealt with this theme by discussing a number of Scripture-passages. It should be observed, however, that he does *not* speak of the *different forms* as in the passage before us. Here one would expect a comparison of the various visions of the prophets in the O.T. like Exod. 3, Is. 6, Ezech. 1, and an explanation of it. But in *A.H.* 4, 20 the possibility of the vision of God is the cardinal question. So we cannot say that this latter chapter is an answer to the point made in 1, 10,3. It is important to notice that the Gnostics also ascribed this epithet to God among many others,⁴⁷ exactly like the church, but they applied it to their Propator and not to the God of the O.T. Then the question arose, not only how the prophets could have seen Him (see above), but also that of understanding the different forms of manifestation. But it was also a question that may be asked by a believing reader of the O.T.

4) *The different covenants and their particular character.*—In the famous passage on the four gospels Irenaeus says: “For this reason were four principal (καθολικαί) covenants given to the human race”: under Adam, Noah, Moses and by Jesus Christ. The texts of a Greek fragment and the Latin translation differ here, because the Greek leaves out Adam, but adds the name of Abraham. The edition of Rousseau–Doutreleau gives good reasons for considering the

46 W. Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, 156 s.v.

47 See Irenaeus, *A.H.* 1, 1,1 report of the Valentinian conception of God: ὑπάρχοντα δ' αὐτὸν ἀχώρητον καὶ ἀόρατον, ἀίδιον τε καὶ ἀγέννητον... and my article Die Gotteslehre bei Aristides und in gnostischen Schriften, *Theologische Zeitschrift* 17 (1961), 166 ff.

Latin text as the original.⁴⁸ For our present purpose it is not necessary to make a decision here, because the only relevant point is the fact that Irenaeus knew of four covenants, but nowhere else in his works does he give a further development of that idea. He is, however, much more concerned with *two* covenants, the old and the new, that of the Law and that of the Gospel. At great length he deals with that subject in Book IV of *Adv. Haer.*: one is the covenant of bondage and service, the other of freedom and the Spirit. But both have been given by one and the same God. He fights here mainly against Marcion, but also against Ptolemaeus. The distinction he makes is a continuation of the line of St. Paul in 2 Cor. and Gal.; we must however also draw attention to Justin Martyr.⁴⁹ A very interesting remark is made in *A.H.* 4, 32,1: *Huius modi quoque de duobus Testamentis senior apostolorum discipulus disputabat, ab uno quidem et eodem Deo utraque ostendens*. It is a signal that these questions were not invented by Irenaeus, but that he follows the track of the Presbyters.⁵⁰ The present investigation does not require a full treatment of the points raised by Irenaeus. Indeed, he is very explicit on the special character of the Old and New Covenant; we are left, however, in darkness about the question how many covenants he counted (four or even more) and if there were more than two, what particular character had the others; nor did he give reasons why there were more than two. The conclusion must be that Irenaeus did give only a very partial answer to the questions he raised here in the passage under discussion.

5) *The text of Romans 11,32.*—Irenaeus does not mention the fact that he is making a quotation; Paul's name is passed over in silence. At first sight the question looks as though it was formulated by our author. In *A.H.* 3, 20,2 we find the same reference: "Just as the physician is proved by his patients, so is God also revealed through man. And therefore Paul declares, 'For God has concluded all'⁵¹ in unbelief, that He may have mercy upon all'; not saying this in reference to spiritual Aeons, but to men, who had been disobedient to God, and being cast off from immortality, then obtained mercy, receiving through the Son of God that adoption." Stress is laid in this passage on the "mercy of God". But no answer is given to the question "why", put in the point

48 A. Rousseau – L. Doutreleau, *Irénée de Lyon, Contre les Hérésies, livre III* (Paris 1974) I, 286; also A. Roberts, *o.c.*, I, 295, nt. 1.

49 Cf. the references in E.J. Goodspeed, *Index Apologeticus* (Leipzig 1912) 71, s.v. διαθήκη.

50 See my article, mentioned p. 310, nt. 9 on the authority of the Presbyters for Irenaeus.

51 Irenaeus read πάντα—(3, 20,1 *omnia*), whereas the editions of the Greek New Testament have τοὺς πάντας, cf. the note of K. Aland – M. Black – B.M. Metzger – A. Wikgren, *The Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart 1966) 562 f. *ad Rom.* 11,32 and the note of W.W. Harvey, *o.c.*, II, 106, nt. 8–107.

under discussion now. Irenaeus in *A.H.* 1, 10,3 gives Rom. 11,32 as a “simple” statement. The fact that neither Paul is named nor quotation-marks are given, is a sign that this word was current in the days of our church-father, so well-known that the source could be omitted, so important as a theological declaration that it was worthwhile to ask what was behind it. And it is easily understood that the words: συνέκλεισε πάντα εἰς ἀπειθειαν ὁ θεός, ἵνα . . . , gave rise to many questions, particularly in discussion with those Gnostics who did accept the authority of St. Paul, but also for men of the Great Church.

6) *Incarnation and passion of the Logos.*—Here again there is no indication that John 1, 14 is quoted. The importance of the Incarnation in Irenaeus’ thought cannot be a matter of dispute;⁵² and the reality of Christ’s suffering he maintains in line of the tradition, cf. e.g. 1 Petr. 2,21; 3,18.⁵³ Of course both the incarnation and the passion of God’s Logos were a stumbling-block for the non-Christians. But there was a more specific reason, I think, to bring up this point. In *A.H.* 3, 11,3, after a quotation of John 1,14, it is said: *Secundum autem nullam sententiam haereticorum, Verbum Dei caro factum est . . . sine carne et impassibilis ab omnibus illis inducitur Dei Verbum, et qui est in superioribus Christus*, though some, making a distinction between the Word and Jesus, teach: *Incarnatum autem et passum . . . eum qui ex dispositione sit . . . Jesum*. In the chapters that precede the text of *A.H.* 1, 10 some more information is given. A summary of gnostic teaching is offered in which “our Lord” is divided in four parts; the Saviour is “free from all suffering, since indeed it was not possible that He should suffer who was at once incomprehensible and invisible . . . , the ‘animal Christ’ underwent suffering, that the mother might exhibit through him a type of the Christ above” (1, 7,2). According to the Gnostics “the Lord came in the last times of the world to endure suffering, for this end, that He might indicate the passion which occurred to the last of the Aeons”⁵⁴ (1, 8,2). The end of ch. 8 is devoted to the exegesis of St. John’s Prologue and a refutation of the conclusions drawn from it by the Gnostics (1, 8,5). Irenaeus points

52 J.N. Bakhuizen van den Brink, *Incarnatie en Verlossing bij Irenaeus* (s-Gravenhage 1934); G. Wingren, *Man and the Incarnation, a study in the biblical theology of Irenaeus* (Edinburgh–London 1959).

53 Cf. also Ignatius, *Ad Trall.* 10: “But if, as some godless men—that is, unbelievers—say, his suffering was only apparent . . .”; *Ad Smyrn.* 2,1 “For he suffered all this for us so that we might be saved; and he truly suffered . . . not, as some unbelievers say, that he appeared to suffer” (translation of R.M. Grant, *The Apostolic Fathers*, IV: *Ignatius of Antioch* [London 1966]).

54 Αἰῶνες taken here in twofold sense! For the expression “in the last times”, see below *ad* 7 (p. 324).

out, that “according to their hypothesis,⁵⁵ the Word did not become flesh at all, inasmuch as He never went outside the Pleroma” and he gives the warning: “Learn then, ye foolish men, that Jesus who suffered for us, and who dwelt among us, is Himself The Word of God” (1, 9,2–3). So it is evident that this matter was of the greatest moment for Irenaeus because the whole work of salvation was at stake. A good deal of his great refutation is circling round this question. Just one quotation may illustrate his answer: “When, however, the Word of God became flesh, He confirmed both these: for both showed forth the image truly, since He became Himself what was His image; and He re-established the similitude after the same manner, by assimilating man to the invisible Father through means of the visible Word. And not by the aforesaid things alone has the Lord manifested Himself, but (He has done this) also by means of His passion”, because by His death on the cross = tree He did away with the effect of the disobedience, which was committed by Adam at a tree (A.H. 5, 16,2–3).

7) *The parousia of the Son of God has taken place in the last times.*—This topic is not concerned with the last Judgment, but with the coming of Jesus into this world.⁵⁶ The combination “in the last times” plays an important role in Irenaeus’ thought.⁵⁷ It was an expression that was characteristic for the eschatological conception of the primitive church and was even taken over by some Gnostics (A.H. 1, 8,2, see the quotation before *ad* 6; it is clear that the Gnostics used a current expression and gave it an interpretation of their own). The answer to this question may be found in several places in Irenaeus’ works, e.g. A.H. 4, 20,4: *Dominus noster Iesus Christus, qui novissimis temporibus homo in hominibus factus est, ut finem coniungeret principio*,⁵⁸ *id est hominem Deo*; 4, 38,1 “And for this cause our Lord, in these last times, when He had summed up all things into Himself, came to us, not as He might have come, but as we were capable of beholding Him.” Is Irenaeus here with the words τουτέστιν κτλ. referring to or has he a reminiscence of Ignatius, *Ad Magn.* 6,1 Jesus Christ ὡς πρὸ αἰώνων παρὰ πατρὶ ἦν καὶ ἐν τέλει ἐφάνη? For Christ as *archè*—Beginning cf.

55 See before p. 315.

56 Cf. my article: Der Ausdruck “In den letzten Zeiten” bei Irenäus, in: *Neotestamentica-Patristica, Festschrift O. Cullmann* (Leiden 1962) 293–304, and G. Jossa, *Regno di Dio e chiesa* (Napoli 1970) 130–147.

57 I discussed all the texts, where Irenaeus uses this expression in my article, mentioned in the previous note, 293–304.

58 See also A.H. 4, 25,1: *Sed haec quidem quae est in praeputio fides, utpote finem conjungens principio, prima et novissima facta est. Etenim ante circumcisionem erat in Abraham, et in reliquis iustis qui placuerunt Deo, sicut demonstravimus: et rursus in novissimis temporibus orta est in humano genere per Domini adventum.*

Col. 1,18; Apoc. 3,14. At the same time a temporal meaning is connected with it. When Christ is called *Arche* = beginning and principle, the paradox arises, why He came in the flesh only at the end of history and not at its beginning. A similar question is raised in Hermas, *Sim.* 9, 12,1–3, here formulated with the typical imagery of Hermas. The wording of Irenaeus clearly betrays dependence upon existing formulae and questions. But in the rest of his works he maintains the fact without explaining however the reasons for this paradox.⁵⁹

8) *The unfolding of the End and of the future events, as found in the Scriptures.*—It is remarkable that this item is not introduced by an interrogative. This fact can be easily understood; not questions about the reasons for what has happened should be raised, but the predictions given in the Scriptures must be disclosed. The latter part of Book V of *A.H.* is devoted to these matters (ch. 27 ff.) in which Papias is cited (33,4) and allegorizing is rejected (cf. e.g. 31,1; 33,4; 35,1). Irenaeus holds, as is well-known, chiliastic views like Justin Martyr. The bishop of Lyons stands in line with the presbyters (36,1), who were so closely connected with John, the author of the Apocalypse. The view of the future is, of course, decisive for the direction of one's life (see e.g. the discussion in 5, 30 about the name of the Antichrist and the risks run by those who make a mistake).

9) *God has made the Gentiles partakers with the saints.*—The formulation of this point strongly recalls Eph. 3, 6 εἶναι τὰ ἔθνη συγκληρονόμα καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμέτοχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Of course ἀπεγνωσμένα is missing there, but this word of despair is a fair summary of the description in Eph. 2, 12. For the connection with “the saints” see Eph. 2, 19 συμπολιταὶ τῶν ἁγίων. The fact that God has brought about this unity is not expressed in so many words in Ephesians, but is the great supposition. At any rate the three adjectives form so striking a combination parallel to Ephesians, that we must conclude that they form a quotation, either direct or by memory. Here again (see p. 323) there is no sign of this being cited. Now this passage from Ephesians is referred to by Irenaeus elsewhere and seems to have a great influence on his thinking: *A.H.* 3, 5,3 the Lord preached to the Circumcised and the apostle to the Gentiles: “He, appearing in these last times, the chief cornerstone, has gathered into one, and united those that were far off and those that were near: that is, the circumcision and the uncircumcision”; 4, 25,1 “those who from the circumcision and . . . those from the uncircumcision are faithful, even as also ‘Christ is the chief-cornerstone’ sustaining all things; and He gathered into the

59 See my publication: *Het Godspraedicaat ‘Het Begin en het Einde’ in de Openbaring van Johannes en bij Flavius Josephus*, in: *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen* (Amsterdam 1976).

one faith of Abraham those who from either covenant are eligible for God's building." These two quotations bring to light what great a weight this passage from Ephesians had for Irenaeus. In *A.H.* 5, 17,4 an echo is heard of two other texts of Ephesians, namely 3,18 and 4,6 also in connection with "the two peoples scattered to the ends of the earth"; and even more interesting is that Irenaeus quotes here one of his predecessors: "and as a certain man among our predecessors observed, 'through the extension of the hands . . . gathering the two peoples to one God,'" this being an explanation of the cross of Jesus. Irenaeus thus stands in a certain tradition in which the uniting of Jews and Christians was important (see below).

10) *The mortal body shall put on immortality.*—This is a clear reminiscence from 1 Cor. 15, 53: Δεῖ γὰρ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτον ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανασία, without mentioning the name of the apostle. But a comparison of the two texts brings to light a number of differences; so Irenaeus is not quoting the words of St. Paul verbatim and directly. On the other hand it should be said that this is an important text for Irenaeus' theology. So he says in *A.H.* 3, 19,1: "by no other means could we have attained to incorruptibility and immortality, unless we had been united to incorruptibility and immortality. But how could we be joined to incorruptibility and immortality unless, first, incorruptibility and immortality had become that which we are, so that the corruptible might be swallowed up by incorruptibility, and the mortal by immortality." Here he has given a certain answer to that question "how", namely how man, corruptible and mortal will be changed. This matter was a point of controversy with those "who despise the entire dispensation of God, and disallow the salvation of the flesh . . ., maintaining that it is not capable of incorruption (*A.H.* 2, 2–3 with proof taken from the Eucharist); cf. also 5, 3,2 with appeal to God's power "to bring back the corruptible to incorruption". A very long exposition of this text is given in *A.H.* 5, 13, a defence of the resurrection of the flesh. The heretics also appealed to the same chapter of St. Paul, namely vs. 50: "Flesh and blood will not inherit the kingdom of God"; so Irenaeus explains with the help of other texts the meaning of the Apostle: the transformation takes place "not after its own proper substance, but after the mighty working of the Lord, who is able to invest the mortal with immortality and the corruptible with incorruption (5, 13,3).—The "resurrection of the flesh" was a burning issue, as we see here, in the controversies of the 2nd-century.⁶⁰ Even after those explanations of the apostle, there remains an open question: How can what Paul had taught come about? Or to put it otherwise:

60 Cf. my article: The newly discovered Gnostic 'Epistle to Rheginos' on the Resurrection, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 15 (1964) 154 ff.

What is the process by which the corruptible and mortal is transformed into something incorruptible and immortal?

11 and 12) *The sayings Hosea 2, 25 and Isaia 54, 1b* (which are more or less combined, but also separated by a double πῶς).—It is striking that we find here an introduction by ἐρεῖ, though the name of the speaker is not revealed. The readers are supposed to know it. At any rate this is a quotation. Another curious fact is, that the former text is also quoted by St. Paul in Rom. 9,25 with definite reference to Hosea, but introduced by the word καλέσω—I shall call. In Hosea 2, 25 LXX however we find the reading ἐρῶ, and that may be the origin of Irenaeus' introduction. But on the other hand the form: ὁ οὐ λαὸς κτλ., is not that of the LXX nor that of the Masoretic Text. Irenaeus has also referred to this word of the prophet in *A.H.* 4, 20,12 (then together with the word of Paul in Rom. 9,25) and in *Dem.* 93 (full quotation from Hosea). It is superfluous to discuss the differences here;⁶¹ the only conclusion we can draw is this, that there is not direct dependence on written documents. The text functions in *A.H.* 4, 20,12 as a proof that God uses the prophets as instruments for the prefiguration of future events; what the prophet did typically in his marriage, was done by Christ in the church, viz., the acceptance of the Gentiles as children of God. In *Dem.* 93 it is one and the first out of three testimonies which are proof "that this nation (sc. the Gentiles) was to become a holy people".⁶² That is in line with the application by Paul and 1 Peter. Item 12 is also cited by Paul in Gal. 4,27. The Apostle applies it to Jerusalem above, the free city in contrast to the earthly Jerusalem under the Mosaic Law; that free Jerusalem is the Church which will have many children = believers. In the same perspective the text is used by Irenaeus, *Dem.* 94: "more children to the Church than

61 Hosea 2,25 ἐλεῖσω τὴν Οὐκ-ἡλεημένην καὶ ἐρῶ τῷ Οὐ-λαῶ-μου Λαὸς μου εἰ σύ (+ var. BV* καὶ ἀγαπήσω τὴν Οὐκ-ἡγαπημένην). Romans 9,25 καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαόν μου λαόν μου καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἡγαπημένην ἡγαπημένην καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς. οὐ λαὸς μου ὑμεῖς, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος (= Hos. 2,1!). 1 Pet. 2,10 οἱ ποτὲ οὐ λαὸς, νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἡλεημένοι, νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες. Irenaeus, *A.H.* 4, 20,12: *Adhuc etiam filios suos nominavit propheta, Non misericordiam consecuta, et Non populus: ut, quemadmodum Apostolus ait, fiat qui non populus, populus: et ea quae non est misericordiam consecuta, misericordiam consecuta: et in loco eliberata, in quo vocabitur non populus, ibi vocabuntur filii Dei vivi.* Irenaeus, *Dem.* 93: "And I will call that which is not my people, my people, and her that was not beloved, beloved. It shall be, in the place where it shall be called not my people, there they shall be called sons of the living God" (translation of J.P. Smith, *St. Irenaeus, Proof of the Apostolic Preaching* [London 1952] 104).

62 The text of *Dem.* 93 reproduced in the previous note is introduced by these words: "was thus announced through Osee in the twelve prophets."

to the Synagogue of the past.”⁶³ Quotations of the same text are also found in that sermon, usually dated in the middle of the 2nd-century, called 2 Clement (2, 1–3), with the exegesis: “since our people seemed to be abandoned by God, but now that we have believed, we have become more numerous than those who seemed to have God,”⁶⁴ and in Justin M., *Apol.* 1, 53,3. 6 as a prophecy that “there should be more believers from the Gentiles than from the Jews and Samaritans” (the Gentiles were “desolate” of the true God, being devoted to idolatry; the Jews and Samaritans had the Word of God delivered to them, but did not recognize Him when He came). In the beginning of this century Rendel Harris already drew attention to these striking similarities and found here conclusive evidence “that the early book of Testimonies contained a section on the numerical and ethical superiority of Gentile Christians to Jews”.⁶⁵ Even if the existence of such a Testimony-book may be a matter of dispute, it is beyond any doubt that Irenaeus has a certain tradition behind him. The combination of these two items 11 and 12 leads us to some observations:

- a) it is remarkable that they are found in the same sequence in the *Demonstratio* 93–94, but there in connection with other words from Scripture. Why do they receive special treatment here?
- b) in *A.H.* 1, 10,3 the meaning of these words looks like a riddle (“how”), whereas in the *Demonstratio* their sense is explained along traditional lines. Was that unknown to Irenaeus while writing the Refutation? That is hardly feasible. Should we think in that direction that was also noticeable in the discussion of other points, viz., that these traditional testimonies were also taken up by the Gnostics and used for their purpose, and that different from that which was traditional? So far I have not come across anything of that sort, but that does not tell very much in view of the

63 Transl. J.P. Smith, *o.c.*, 105 with note 371.

64 Transl. of R.M. Grant and H.H. Graham, *The Apostolic Fathers*, II: *First and Second Clement* (London 1965) 113.

65 J. Rendel Harris, *Testimonies* (Cambridge 1916) I, 17.—For Jewish exegesis of this text, see H. Strack – P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (München 1926) III, 574 f.—The text is also found in a composite quotation *Epist. Apost.* 33: “that the word of the prophet may be fulfilled, which saith: Behold, out of Syria will I begin to call together a new Jerusalem, and Sion will I subdue unto me, and it shall be taken, and the place which is childless shall be called the son and daughter of my Father, and my bride” (translation of M.R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament* [Oxford 1924] 496 f.). On the possible origin of this apocryphal saying, see M. Hornschuh, *Studien zur Epistula Apostolorum* (Berlin 1965) 84 ff. But whatever may be the origin, in the present context it has been applied to Paul and the Gentile church.

defective state of the sources, which cannot lead to a valid *argumentum e silentio*. At the present moment the question is: How had the words been used?

- c) these Scripture-texts were used in controversy with the Jews to buttress the claim of the church, that she is the people of God. It is interesting to see that they occupied such an important place in this document; the more so when we also take item 9 into account. Is this an indication that the Christians were still engaged in this debate with the Jews in those areas which form the surroundings of Irenaeus' theology, Asia Minor and Gaul?

After this examination of the separate items enumerated here by Irenaeus, we must try to evaluate this part of the argument. Both in its form and contents it shows a special character which makes it clearly distinctive from its surroundings and—we may say—from the rest of Irenaeus' works.

In surveying the sequence of the various points, we do not find a regular, logical structure: creation is mentioned after a reference to the fall of angels and men; three items which belong together in the field of controversy about the participation of former Gentiles in the church are separated by a word on the resurrection. It is impossible to discover a theological outline, the chapter-headings of which are mentioned like in a handbook for dogmatics. Some points may open very fruitful perspectives like those on the Covenants, as we see many centuries later in special schools of calvinistic theology, and on eschatology; but others have a more restricted scope. And, indeed, Irenaeus did not intent to give such an outline or table of contents for a forthcoming handbook. He had chosen these topics more or less at random. That is not the impression of a reader, but was indicated by the author himself, because, before bringing this list to a close, he says: "these points and others of like nature." So he could have given more. But it remains completely hidden why these were picked out, while similar ones were left out. So much however we can safely say that these points were extremely important. And not only for Irenaeus alone, but, as is suggested by the introduction, also for people who are going to speak with their special "understanding" (σύνεσις, see p. 312f).

This brings us to an element of prime importance for the understanding of this paragraph. It should not be overlooked, as we observed before (p. 314), that at the end of ch. 10, 3 Irenaeus returns to its beginning, but that before doing so he brings the insertion to a suitable end. He does not say, however, by way of conclusion: "these and other similar points could be mentioned," or simply "etcetera". But he ends with a quotation from St. Paul; and this is not a pious or solemn conclusion, but has a direct function. This word of the apostle

is not introduced by the simple “he said”, but by ἐπεβόησεν (lat. *exclamavit*), a verb that denotes the discharging of emotions by shouting.⁶⁶ This tone rings in Irenaeus’ ears when hearing the final words of Rom. 11, 33 (n.b. following vs. 32, that had been quoted *sub* item 5!) and quite correctly. So the Apostle wrote after the long dissertation of Israel’s place in Salvation-history, on election, on unbelief and salvation for the Gentiles, on the mysteries of God’s ways with His chosen people.⁶⁷ Paul bursts out in wonder: having followed God’s ways he must confess that they are unsearchable and inscrutable; he finds an unfathomable depth in God’s wisdom and knowledge! Is it for a special reason that Irenaeus quotes these words about the “depth” of God’s wisdom in their full solemnity? According to Hippolytus, *Ref.* 5, 6,4 the Gnostics called themselves by that name of “Knowing people” φάσκοντες μόνοι τὰ βάθη γινώσκειν and Irenaeus had heard them boasting in the same way: *altitudines*⁶⁸ *Dei exquisisse se dicunt* (A.H. 2, 28,9); *profunda Dei advenisse se dicentes* (A.H. 2, 22,3); see also his question: *quemadmodum hi qui nunquam Paulo adjuncti fuerunt, gloriantur abscondita et enarrabilia didicisse sacramenta?* (A.H. 3, 14,1).⁶⁹ People who were boasting that they “knew” the depths are reminded here of Paul’s word of wonder: unsearchable and inscrutable! So is the wisdom and knowledge of God.

This word of St. Paul was according to Irenaeus directly relevant to the preceding questions (ἐπὶ τούτων...); it is valid in the case of the themes that had been summed up. Therefore the list given by Irenaeus is not just a series of theological topics, but of *mysteries* in which the greatness of God’s wisdom and knowledge reveal themselves. In this light the whole passage must be read. This sets the task and also the limitations to those who speak with “intelligence”. What was the purpose of this list? Not to give a number of questions that followed from the *Regula Fidei* or were suitable themes for discussion. But what else? Let me put it this way: What is the relation of these questions to the rest of Irenaeus’ works? Is the *Demonstratio* or the *Adversus Haereses* an exemplification of what he had in mind?

The examination of the various topics brought to light that a certain number is dealt with by Irenaeus elsewhere, but some are not. So to his mind

66 See e.g. the usage in Justinus M., *Apol.* 1, 68,2; *Mart. Polycarpi* 3; 12,2.

67 O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*¹² (Göttingen 1963) 285 ff. and other commentaries *i.l.*

68 The same word in the Latin translation of Irenaeus, A.H. 1, 10,3.

69 Cf. also A.H. 1, *praef.* 2: τὰ τερατώδη καὶ βαθέα μυστήρια, ἃ οὐ πάντες χωροῦσιν, clearly a quotation of an expression, used by the Gnostics.—Is there also a reminiscence of Paul’s words in A.H. 1, 2,2 διὰ τε τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ βάθους καὶ τὸ ἀνεξιχνίαστον τοῦ Πατρὸς? Then the reminder of Irenaeus would be very much to the point.

this was not a group of “the most urgent themes for theology”. Besides that: Why is the list far from being exhaustive, but selective? There are two more observations to make: a) Irenaeus often does not give an answer of his own, but follows a certain tradition; why is such a special “understanding” here prerequisite?—b) even where passages in his works can be found that help us to see the background of these questions, he simply states the fact, but by way of explanation he gives some bible texts without further exploration of the matter. Take e.g. item 10; we saw that Irenaeus devotes much space to it and combats the Gnostics who rejected it with an appeal to another text of St. Paul; it is more or less an exercise in exegesis, it maintains *that* the change will take place, but does not answer the question, *how* the corruptible will take on incorruptibility. Or if we look at item 2, we see that Irenaeus accepts the fact, but does not explain why God created these different worlds; that question may lead to deep inquiries⁷⁰ into these mysteries, an open course to those gifted with divine “understanding”. In other words, the answer will pass that level of theology on which bishop Irenaeus is working. All topics mentioned in this list are bound together by one thread, have God, His Logos or Son as its subject, are concerned with His mighty deeds and raise the question, *why* and *how* He did or shall do so. They lead into the sanctuary of God’s council, the “depth” of God’s wisdom.

Now, if on the one hand we see that these points are concerned with deep mysteries, and on the other hand, that this passage is directed against Gnostics, we can also understand, why all the verbs our author is using here express the notion of preaching, proclamation. The Gnostics had their esoteric teaching, only accessible and given to the happy few. Particularly telling in this respect is the verb *μὴ σιωπᾶν* which is the direct counter-part of all secret teaching.⁷¹

What is the origin of these questions? They have no *direct* connection with the *Regula Fidei* and do not follow from the formulation of this Creed. They have been prompted from elsewhere. Whence? In various cases we found Scripture-texts in these questions, without, however, more precise indication such as is given in most cases in *A.H.* Of course a special reference to the Scriptures is made in item 8, but there too it is done in a fairly general way. These words of the Bible are not introduced under the authority of Prophets and Evangelists, but appear to have a place of their own, to be part and parcel of Christian theological vocabulary. In many cases we discovered that they played a role in

70 N.B. *ἐξερπυνᾶν*, cf. 1 Petr. 1,10 and the commentaries of Selwyn and H. Windisch – H. Preisker, *i.l.*

71 O. Casel, *De philosophorum graecorum silentio mystico* (Giessen 1919) *passim*.

controversies with that special christianized form of Gnosticism that worried Irenaeus so much.

In the third place, a relation with that group of Irenaeus' predecessors, the "Presbyters", can be traced. It is clear enough that these men had great authority for him.⁷² The fact that this relation remains somewhat vague is due to the defective state of our documentation.

Can we use these statements as expressions of Irenaeus' own theology? To a certain extent they are, but on the other hand they are open questions. From the formal side, the wording of these items, we may safely say that we hear in this passage the voice of Irenaeus. It has a rhetorical ring. It is so carefully structured that it must be the work of our author notwithstanding his modesty and reserve with regard to rhetorical accomplishments, expressed in the preface to his work (*A.H. I, praef. 3*). Yet, we must make a distinction here between the formulation and the contents. Here again I wish to emphasize the difference between these questions and the treatment of some themes elsewhere, as was pointed out before (p. 330f). Some of these items have been taken up by Irenaeus, but others were not. The latter group is only known as important theological subjects from this passage, as far as Irenaeus is concerned.

What does that tell us? Four observations may put us on the right scent:

- a) according to Irenaeus, these "mysteries" were suitable subjects for those churchmen, gifted with great intelligence, to labour on;
- b) Irenaeus gives here a sample of such themes and is not exhaustive; the fact that these are those he formulated, while leaving the rest under the caption "such like", shows that they came first to his mind and in all likelihood were the most prominent;
- c) a group of these items (9–11–12) find, as was pointed out before (p. 325f., 327 ff.), their background in a situation of the church, when and where the unity of the Jewish and Gentile bodies of believers was a burning issue. It cannot be said that, for Irenaeus, this was still the case. It can only be brought home to him from elsewhere.
- d) the various items are not directly connected with each other; they fall, so to say, in different *loci theologici*; one dealing with creation, another with the work of Christ, yet another with eschatology.

When we take these considerations together and reflect on their meaning, we come to the following conclusion: this list of theological questions gives us an

⁷² See my article, mentioned p. 310, nt. 9.

interesting insight into those questions which moved the theological thinking in the sixties and seventies of the 2nd century.

This is an important conclusion. Our documentary evidence on theological reflection in the church during the greater part of that crucial age is fairly one-sided (Apologists, Gnostics) and certainly fragmentary.⁷³ Here in this list of Irenaeus *A.H.* 1, 10,3 we get glimpses of themes that stimulated theological reflection. Together with the sayings of the Presbyters, which Irenaeus has transmitted, this document may be a divining-rod pointing to the obscure realm of dogmatic development at that time.

What is the relation to the *Regula Fidei* or the *Paradosis* which Irenaeus found in the unanimity of the churches throughout the world? These matters did not come up in reading that *Regula Fidei*, but from certain biblical texts or Christian theological speech; they prompted questions of "why?" and "how". They were open to "understanding", to "theological reflection", although Irenaeus sees the danger of people who teach so, "devoid of divine understanding" as is said at the end of this paragraph. The addition of the word "divine" should not pass unnoticed. Since these questions involve "mysteries", are concerned with God's "inscrutable ways", only "divine understanding" is able to enter into this Sanctuary. Otherwise the field may seem open for wild speculation and human fancies. It is not fenced off, but some guide-lines are given to prevent men from going astray. These guiding principles are found in the faith about God and Jesus Christ as confessed by the Church universal, in the *Hypothesis* (see before, p. 315ff) the Church held.

This document does not reflect a kind of diversity between "Glauben und Religion" (Kattenbusch); nor is it an explication of the simple faith (so von Harnack).⁷⁴ Irenaeus did not limit a deeper understanding, but tried to give a safe compass. God and Jesus Christ as confessed by the Church had to be the polar stars.

The themes he listed are handed on by the life in the church of his day. They played a role in the discussions with the Gnostic teachers; but they had not been dictated or put on the table by these gentlemen. For we should not close

73 See the survey of fragments by R.M. Grant, *The Fragments of the Greek Apologists and Irenaeus*, in *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey* (Freiburg i. Br. 1963) p. 179 ff.; E. Preuschen, *Antilegomena* (Giessen 1901); some early Acts of the Martyrs and parts of the so-called New Testament Apocrypha; the Paschal Homily of Melito.

74 F. Kattenbusch, see before p. 315; A. Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*⁴ (Tübingen 1909) I, 565: after having cited some sentences from *A.H.* 1, 10,3: "Das Verhältnis von Glaube und theologischer Gnosis ist von Irenäus so bestimmt worden, dass sich in dieser der Glaube einfach explicirt."

our eyes to the fact that Irenaeus had to do with gnostic schools and communities that nestled close to Christianity, used the same words, and tried to dupe the simple faithful.⁷⁵

Hence, it was often difficult to draw the borderline. And yet these teachers were there, and that made the situation so precarious. But one could not close his eyes to this sort of questions. Intelligent teachers in the church, who might run the risk of daring speculations, may think about these questions which would come up in attentive listening to the Bible, if only they were endowed by “divine understanding”.

From this vantage-point we can see and understand why Irenaeus had to deal with this second group of teachers and did it much more extensively than with the former (see p. 313); for here lurked the greater dangers. A careful reading of this list in Irenaeus, *A.H.* 1, 10,3 gives us an insight into some of the theological thinking that was going on in the church, in its themes and movements. Here lies the importance of that curious passage that Irenaeus inserted in that fundamental chapter of his refutation of the “Knowledge falsely so called”.

Appendix

Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 1, 10,3

Τὸ δὲ πλεῖον ἢ ἔλαττον κατὰ σύνεσιν εἰδέναι τινὰς οὐκ ἐν τῷ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν αὐτὴν ἀλλάσσειν γίνεται καὶ ἄλλον θεὸν παρεπινοεῖν παρὰ τὸν δημιουργὸν καὶ ποιητὴν καὶ τροφέα τοῦδε τοῦ παντός ὡς μὴ ἀρκουμένους τούτῳ, ἢ ἄλλον Χριστὸν ἢ ἄλλον Μονογενῆ, ἀλλὰ ἐν τῷ τὰ ὅσα ἐν παραβολαῖς εἴρηται προσεπεξεργάζεσθαι καὶ συνοικειοῦν τῇ τῆς πίστεως ὑποθέσει καὶ ἐν τῷ τὴν τε πραγματείαν καὶ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ ἀνθρωπότητι γενομένην ἐκδιηγείσθαι

- 1) καὶ ὅτι ἐμακροθύμησεν ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τε τῇ τῶν παραβεβηκότων ἀγγέλων ἀποστασίᾳ καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ παρακοῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων σαφηνίζειν
- 2) καὶ διὰ τί τὰ μὲν πρόσκαιρα τὰ δὲ αἰώνια καὶ τὰ μὲν οὐράνια τὰ δὲ ἐπίγεια εἰς καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς θεὸς πεποίηκεν ἀπαγγέλλειν

75 See *A.H.* 3, 15,2: “By these words they entrap the more simple, and entice them, imitating our phrasology . . . (they ask) how it is, that when they hold doctrines, similar to ours, we, without cause, keep ourselves aloof from them . . . they describe to them in private the unspeakable mystery of their Pleroma”; *A.H.* 4, 33,3 “(It appears), then, that their tongues alone, forsooth, have conceded the unity (of God), while their (real) opinion and their understanding by their habit of investigating profundities . . . have fallen away from (this doctrine of) unity, and taken up the notion of manifold deities.”

- 3) και διὰ τί ἀόρατος ὢν ἐφάνη τοῖς προφήταις ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἐν μιᾷ ἰδέᾳ, ἀλλὰ ἄλλως ἄλλοις συνιεῖν
- 4) καὶ διὰ τί διαθήκαι πλείους γεγόνασι τῇ ἀνθρωπότητι μνηνεῖν, καὶ τίς ἐκάστης τῶν διαθηκῶν ὁ χαρακτήρ διδάσκειν
- 5) καὶ διὰ τί συνέκλεισε πάντα εἰς ἀπείθειαν ὁ θεός, ἵνα τοὺς πάντας ἐλεήσῃ, ἐξερευνᾶν
- 6) καὶ διὰ τί ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἔπαθεν, εὐχαριστεῖν
- 7) καὶ διὰ τί ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν καιρῶν ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, τουτέστιν ἐν τῷ τέλει ἐφάνη ἡ ἀρχή, ἀπαγγέλλειν
- 8) καὶ περὶ τοῦ τέλους καὶ τῶν μελλόντων, ὅσα τε κεῖται ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς, ἀναπτύσσειν
- 9) καὶ τί ὅτι τὰ ἀπεγνωσμένα ἔθνη συγκληρονόμα καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμετόχα τῶν ἀγίων πεποίηκεν ὁ θεός, μὴ σιωπᾶν
- 10) καὶ πῶς τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο σαρκίον ἐνδύσεται ἀθανασίαν καὶ τὸ φθαρτὸν ἀφθαρσίαν, διαγγέλλειν
- 11) πῶς τε ἐρεῖ “ὁ οὐ λαὸς λαὸς καὶ ἡ οὐκ ἡγαπημένη ἡγαπημένη”,
- 12) καὶ πῶς “πλείονα τῆς ἐρήμου τὰ τέκνα, μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα” κηρύσσειν—

ἐπὶ τούτων γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμοίων αὐτοῖς ἐπεβόησεν ὁ ἀπόστολος “ὦ βάθος πλούτου καὶ σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως θεοῦ, ὡς ἀνεξερευνήτα τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνεξιχνίαστοι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ”, ἀλλὰ οὐκ ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ τὸν κτιστὴν καὶ δημιουργὸν Μητέρα τούτου καὶ αὐτῶν Ἐνθύμησιν Αἰῶνος πεπλανημένου παρεπινοεῖν καὶ εἰς τοσοῦτον ἥκειν βλασφημίας. οὐδὲ (ἐν τῷ) τὸ ὑπὲρ ταύτην πάλιν Πλήρωμα τότε μὲν τριάκοντα, νῦν δὲ ἀνήριθμον φύλον Αἰώνων ἐπιψεύδεσθαι, καθὼς λέγουσιν οὗτοι οἱ ἄληθως ἔρημοι θείας συνέσεως διδάσκαλοι, τῆς οὔσης ἐκκλησίας πάσης μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν πίστιν ἐχούσης εἰς πάντα τὸν κόσμον, καθὼς προέφαμεν.

The Authority of the Presbyters in Irenaeus' Works

The inaugural address with which our friend Nils Dahl started his career as professor in Oslo, was entitled “Anamnesis”.¹ Therefore it may be appropriate to begin this contribution to his “Festschrift” by some words of recollection, how our friendship began.

It was shortly after World War II. I was working on the conception of the church in the New Testament and had found a reference somewhere to a book by a Norwegian scholar on “Das Volk Gottes”.² But it was not to be found in any of the Dutch libraries, owing to the war-circumstances, and it could not be ordered because of currency restrictions. So I wrote a letter to the author to see if he could help me in one way or another, and he most kindly did so in sending me a copy of his work. This present not only helped me in my thinking on the “people of God”, long before this expression became popular in the ecumenical vocabulary, but was and still is for me so valuable, because it was a clear token of the reality of that theme-word. Four years later we met in person at the St. Paul's pilgrimage, organized by the Church of Greece in 1951. The memories of that great occasion stand out in my mind very sharply, also that meeting with Nils Dahl. He had not had the opportunity to be with us from the very beginning, but joined our party in Saloniki, dropping in as it were, out of the blue one after-noon and telling his story in that way that is so characteristic for him. Since then our friendship has continued through the years in spite of seas that separate us, being confirmed for ever in 1967 when I received the same Oslo-ring which he so well deserved in 1941.

These simple recollections have a deep meaning in my life. They fit in a way remarkably well in the pattern shaping this “Festschrift”, because the Church of the New Testament, that “people of God”, is for both of us not an abstract idea, but a living reality; and that reality exists and manifests itself in contact from person to person. This aspect had always been an essential feature of the Church of Christ. This is one of the reasons, but a weighty one at that, for choosing the topic of this contribution.

The church-father Irenaeus mentions on several occasions in his extant works, mainly in his “Adversus Haereses”, a group of predecessors whom he calls “the

1 N.A. Dahl, *Anamnesis, Mémoire et Commémoration dans le christianisme primitif*, in: *Studia Theologica* I (1947) pp. 69–95.

2 N.A. Dahl, *Das Volk Gottes, eine Untersuchung zum Kirchenbewusstsein des Urchristentums*, Oslo, 1941.

presbyters" (*seniores*, in the Latin translation). He refers to them and quotes their sayings. Whether they formed a "group" in sociological terms, is a question that may be left open for the moment. At any rate they were people of authority and ranked highly in Irenaeus' esteem, since they formed a link with the apostles. Some names are mentioned which may be connected with these "elders", but for the greater part they are anonymous.

The fact of their existence and importance is well-known and since the days of J.B. Lightfoot, A. Harnack and Th. Zahn—to mention only these giants in the field of New Testament and Patristic studies—much attention has been given to this important, but rather enigmatic group.³ Shadowy though they are, they seem to be key-figures in certain areas of the church in that age of transition, which is the 2nd century, still encompassed in many places by the clouds of historical darkness.

In all previous discussions of this subject one point that is, so it seems to me, of vital importance to determine the role these presbyters played in the thought of Irenaeus has been overlooked. It is the purpose of this paper to bring this to light.

Since Irenaeus introduced these presbyters by quoting certain of their sayings we will take our start at these passages. They have been collected in a very convenient form by E. Preuschen⁴ and in the German translation of G. Ficker.⁵ But for the object we have in view it will be important to look not only at the character of these sayings (without giving a detailed exegesis of their contents), but also at the context in which the reason why they are introduced. After having reached by that way a firm ground we may also look around to find other material to broaden our outlook and to come to a better understanding of the role these presbyters have played.

Preuschen's collection opens with 5 passages, marked by the letters a–e, in which we hear the voice of an unnamed gentleman, called by Irenaeus *κρείστων ἡμῶν* = *superior nobis* (*Adv. Haer.* I praef. 2; I 13,3; III 17,4). In one place the plural

3 See G.G. Blum, *Tradition und Sukzession, Studien zum Normbegriff des Apostolischen von Paulus bis Irenaeus*, Berlin-Hamburg 1963, S. 188–195, where the older literature is also mentioned; J.G. Sobosan, *The role of the Presbyter: an investigation into the Adversus Haereses of Saint Irenaeus*, in *Scottish Journal of Theology* XXVII (1974), pp. 129–146 (the reason why these and other views are not discussed, is given at the end of this contribution).

4 E. Preuschen, *Antilegomena, die Reste der ausserkanonischen Evangelien und urchristlichen Ueberlieferungen*, Giessen 1901, S. 63–71 (text), 152–159 (translation).

5 G. Ficker, *Sprüche und Auslegungen der Presbyter des Irenäus*, in: E. Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*², Tübingen 1924, S. 540–551.

is used: *hi qui ante nos fuerunt et quidem multo nobis meliores* (A.H. IV praef. 2), whereas in another part of his refutation of the gnostic Marcus Irenaeus cites some verses from “the divine elder”; “the saintly elder”⁶ (A.H. I 15,6: ὁ θεῖος πρεσβύτερος, ὁ θεοφιλὴς πρεσβύτερος).

For the present moment we set aside these texts, because it is not clear whether this “superior” man is included in the category of the “presbyters”⁷ and at any rate is not marked by that special characteristic that is found in other cases and to which we wish to devote special attention. At the end of this paper we shall return to the special title given by Irenaeus to the author of these sayings.

The first time the presbyters are mentioned is A.H. II 22,5. Irenaeus wants to demonstrate that all stages of human life: “infants and children, and boys, and youths and old men” are sanctified by Jesus Christ, who “passed through every age” (§4). Our author follows here the division of human life in different stages as was usual in antiquity.⁸ He maintains: “So likewise He was an old man for old man, that He might be a perfect Master for all, not merely as respects the setting forth of the truth, but also as regards age, sanctifying at the same time the aged also, and becoming an example to them likewise”. That period of life began at forty: *a quadragesimo autem et quinquagesimo anno declinat jam in aetatem seniore, quam habens Dominus noster docebat* (§5). In proof of this Irenaeus appeals to the witness of these “presbyters”: καὶ πάντες οἱ πρεσβύτεροι μαρτυροῦσιν οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν Ἰωάννη τῷ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῇ συμβεβληκότες, παραδεδωκέναι ταῦτα τὸν Ἰωάννην. Παρέμεινε γὰρ αὐτοῖς μέχρι τῶν Τραϊανοῦ χρόνων. *Quidam autem eorum non solum Johannem, sed et alios Apostolos viderunt, et haec eadem ab ipsis audierunt, et testantur de hujus modi relatione*(5). This testimony—note the importance of this word in this passage—is called upon against people who

6 The English translation followed in this paper is that of A.Roberts–W.H. Rambaut in the *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, vol. V and IX.

7 In the passages, quoted before he is never called by that name twice only he is called πρεσβύτερος. But in the texts we are about to discuss the word is always πρεσβύτερος.

8 For Irenaeus see also A.H. II 24,4 (in discussion of the symbolic meaning of “five”.) There were different systems of division, see F. Boll, *Die Lebensalter*, Leipzig-Berlin 1913; he remarks, *l.c.*, pp. 18–19, that five stages are very seldom mentioned. According to J.H. Waszink, *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani De Anima*, Amsterdam 1947, p. 571 ad *De Anima* 56,6 “a division of life into five stages was usual among the Romans”, referring to Servius, in *Aen.* 5,295: *aetates omnes Varro sic dividit: infantiam pueritiam adolescentiam iuventam senectam*, but “among Christians this division is rarely found”; see however C. Gnllka, *Aetas Spiritalis, die Überwindung der natürlichen Altersstufen als Ideal frühchristlichen Lebens*, Köln-Bonn 1972, S. 105, Ak. 44–106, who lists a number of (later) christian texts.

held that Jesus' teaching-office lasted only one year. Therefore Irenaeus continues: "Whom then should we rather believe? Whether such men as these, or Ptolemaeus, who never saw the apostles" (*qui Apostolos numquam vidit, vestigium autem Apostoli ne in somniis quidem assecutus est*). Finally a Scripture-text is adduced, viz. John 8:56–57: "Thou art not yet fifty years old" etc., with the comments: "Now, such language is fittingly applied to one who has already passed the age of forty, without having as yet reached his fiftieth year. . . . But to one who is only thirty years old it would be unquestionably be said, 'Thou art not yet forty years old' (§6)." For our present discussion the point at issue, viz. the chronology of Jesus' life is of minor importance. It was fully treated by Walter Bauer in his great work: "Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen".⁹ But most relevant is the way in which Irenaeus drives home his point that Jesus had reached an age of over forty.

He first calls to the witness-box the Presbyters, who, without exception, testify to this age of Jesus. In contrast to Irenaeus' opponents they are reliable witnesses, because they had lived in close contact with John¹⁰ and that apostle had delivered that statement to them. Important in that connection is the chronological fact of John's age, living on till after 98 AD, for this meets the eventual objection that the Presbyters had just for a short moment known the apostle; no, the statement rests on the solid foundation of long acquaintance. But not only that. The Presbyters were not dependent on one single apostle, for some of them "saw . . . the other apostles also and heard the very same account from them, and bear testimony as to the (validity of) the statement". The fact of this direct personal acquaintance, repeated twice in this passage, is highly valuable in Irenaeus' train of argument, because it is at this very point that he thinks he is able to disparage the ideas of his opponents, because *they did not* meet the apostles. It is also interesting to see that the proof from Scripture comes after this testimony of the Presbyters. For his purpose this was a correct procedure, because that text from the Gospel was open to different interpretations, but once the fact that Jesus had reached the age between forty and fifty had been established by the word of the Presbyters on the authority of the Apostle John, further corroboration could be found in the written record of the Gospel.

9 W. Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, Tübingen 1909, S. 291–295.

10 This word συμβεβληκότες, is also found in the notice about Clemens Romanus in A.H. III 3,3: Κλήμης, ὁ καὶ ἑωρακώς τοὺς μακαρίους Ἀποστόλους καὶ συμβεβληκώς αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔτι ἔναυλον τὸ Κήρυγμα τῶν Ἀποστόλων καὶ τὴν παράδοσιν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἔχων. This passage I discussed in an article: *Two Notes on Irenaeus*, to appear in: *Vigiliae Christianae*.

Let it be noticed that this historical fact of Jesus' life stands apart from the dogmatic conclusion Irenaeus was deriving from it. The Presbyter's function here is a firm link connecting Irenaeus and his contemporaries directly with Jesus' disciples who gave absolutely reliable information about the Master and Sanctifier. Their authority lies in their quality as eyewitnesses, who had heard it from the Apostles themselves.

The second text in which words of a certain Presbyter are introduced follows the same line and shows that this qualification of the Presbyters was not a casual remark of Irenaeus. In a very important passage of his Refutation Irenaeus meets the criticism levelled against the Old Testament from the moral point of view. He does not bring into the field his own arguments, but appeals to one of the presbyters who had already fully discussed this matter. The opening paragraph of this section reads as follows (A.H. IV 27,1): *Quemadmodum audivi a quodam presbytero, qui audierat ab his qui Apostolos viderant, et ab his qui didicerant*. This text offers some difficulties. As it stands, we find that the Presbyter whose words are transmitted by Irenaeus, was not a direct disciple of the Apostles, but linked with them by intermediaries (*qui Apostolos viderant*). In A.H. IV 32,1 however, it is said: *Hujusmodi quoque de duobus testamentis senior apostolorum discipulus disputabat*. Rousseau drew attention to these conflicting statements without offering a solution.¹¹ It is somewhat strange that in this note Rousseau left out the word *quoque* which as a matter of fact stands in his text.¹²

Harvey therefore made a distinction between the speaker in ch. 27 etc. (see also A.H. IV 31,1: *talia quaedam enarrans de antiquis presbyter reficiebat nos*) and the one in 32,1.¹³ Unfortunately we have not the original Greek text at our disposal. But since the combination of "presbyter" with "disciple of the Apostles" is, as we shall see, elsewhere in Irenaeus, more or less formalised, we must conclude that Harvey's distinction was correct. And this is confirmed by the use of the word *quoque*, introducing not only a new topic, but also a new speaker.

Another difficulty is met in the words: *ab his qui didicerant*. Which people are meant? The repetition of the words: *ab his qui* . . . points in the direction of two different groups. Rousseau thinks of men like Mark and Luke, referring to III 1,1 Μάρκος ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου and III 10,1 *Lucas autem sectator et discipulus apostolorum*, whom he distinguishes from the *seniores* who are

11 A. Rousseau c.s., *Irénée de Lyon, Contre les Hérésies livre IV*, Paris 1965, tom. I, pp. 263–264.

12 A. Rousseau, *l.c.*, tom. II, p. 796.

13 W. W. Harvey, *Sancti Irenaei . . . Libros quinque adversus Haereses*, Cambridge 1857, tom. II, p. 254, nt. 5.

called “disciples of the apostles” (IV 32,1; V 5,1; V 36,2, see below), his argument being that the authority of the presbyter who is speaking in these chapters could gain nothing from his being the disciple of other disciples.¹⁴ The validity of this argument is questionable. There is a distinction between the words “*viderant*” and “*didicerant*”, not between certain groups of μαθηταί. After the survey of all the evidence offered by Irenaeus we can try to clarify the nature of this distinction and its value for the authority which Irenaeus attached to it. So much can be said already here, that these presbyters with their expositions had successfully removed in Irenaeus’ opinion the stumbling-blocks which some critics had discovered in the Old Testament. The Presbyters are the right teachers: *Hi enim eam quae est in unum Deum qui omnia fecit fidem nostram custodiunt... et Scripturas sine periculo nobis exponunt, neque Deum blasphemantes, neque patriarchas exhonores, neque prophetas contemnentes* (A.H. IV 26,5, the paragraph preceding that long exposition in chapters 27–32).

In A.H. IV 41,2 Irenaeus refers to a predecessor (*quidam ante nos*) who drew attention to the fact that the word “son” is used in different senses¹⁵ and this linguistic insight is applied by our author to the relation between God and men. Another quotation from the Presbyters is given in A.H. V 5,1, intimating that the righteous men of the Old Testament Henoch and Elijah of whom it is said in Scripture that they had been transferred, went to the Paradise. The introduction to this passage reads as follows: διὸ καὶ λέγουσιν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, οἱ τῶν ἀποστόλων μαθηταί. The plural indicates that the opinion expressed here was not that of just a single person, but one shared by various people.

In contrast with this plurality of spokesmen the sayings about the extension of the hands of Jesus on the cross¹⁶ meaning the assembling of “two peoples to one God”, in A.H. V 17,4 is ascribed to one particular man: ὡς ἔφη τις τῶν προβεβηκότων, in the Latin version: *quidam de senioribus*, which may be seen as an essentially correct translation, “advanced in years”.¹⁷ Or should we interpret it as *ante nos*, cf. A.H. IV 41,2 (see above)? For our present purpose the difference is not of vital importance.

14 A. Rousseau, *L.c.*, tom. I, p. 263: ... un presbytre, dont l'autorité doctrinale n'a rien à gagner du fait qu'il serait le disciple d'autres presbytres". That is exactly the question that can not be solved by a *petitio principii*. For a possible reply see the end of this paper.

15 On the text see A. Rousseau, *L.c.*, tom. II, pp. 283–285; but that is not of special interest for our present discussion.

16 For the meaning of this expression cf. H. Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief*, Tübingen 1920, S. 369, 370 ad Barn. 12:2–3.

17 A. Rousseau c.s., *Irénée de Lyon, Contre les Hérésies* Livre V, Paris 1969, tom. I, p. 285.— H. G. Liddell – R. Scott – H. St. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*⁹, Oxford 1940, p. 1470. s.v.

A very interesting qualification of the Presbyters which reminds us of that in book II (see before, p. 249f) is found in *A.H.* V 30,1. In this eschatological part of his work Irenaeus attaches great weight to the number of the Beast in Revelation 13:18. "In all the most approved and ancient copies" of the Apocalypse this number is 666, but Irenaeus knows of a variant reading: 616. This is not a minor difference, for the determination of the figure that was foretold, is here at stake. So it is of the utmost importance for the Christians who want to understand the signs of the time to have the correct number, lest they should be led astray. So Irenaeus does not only appeal to the best manuscripts, but also to the witness of those who had been acquainted with John, the author of the Apocalypse:¹⁸ μαρτυροῦντων αὐτῶν ἐκείνων τῶν κατ' ὄψιν τὸν Ἰωάννην ἑωρακότων. Finally it is taught by rational teaching: τοῦ λόγου διδάσκοντος ἡμᾶς.¹⁹ The manuscripts could be tampered with, but not so the testimony of those who had seen the author himself. In this highly important question those *who have seen* John play a decisive role. This personal relation is the only thing that counts here, not the fact that these people are Presbyters or seniors to Irenaeus.

This combination indeed is made somewhat later in the same book, viz. *A.H.* V 33,3 where Irenaeus describes the expected future of the new creation: "when also the creation, having been renovated and set free, shall fructify with an abundance of all kinds of food". That the Lord had prophesied in a very plastic way: "The days shall come . . .".²⁰ This word is not found in the Gospels, but came to Irenaeus by oral transmission: *Quemadmodum Presbyteri meminerunt, qui Johannem discipulum Domini viderunt, audisse se ab eo quemadmodum de temporibus illis docebat Dominus et dicebat*. Then follows a saying that in its first section shows a striking resemblance to *Apoc. Baruch* 29:5. The relation between those two texts is not a matter of concern for us now.²¹ Whatever may be the ultimate source of these two versions, that was no question for Irenaeus:

18 Cf. *A.H.* IV 30,4 *Johannes discipulus Domini vidit in Apocalypsi*, and in many other places, cf. J. Hoh, *Die Lehre des hl. Irenäus über das Neue Testament*, Münster i. W. 1919, S. 55. See also the interesting note about the Apocalypse in *A.H.* V 30,2: οὐδε γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἑωράθη ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς.

19 For the interpretation see the extensive note in A. Rousseau, *L.c.*, tom. II, pp. 331–333.

20 Well-known eschatological introduction in the N.T. Matth. 9:15, Mc. 2:20, Luc. 5:25, 7:22, 21:6, 23, 29, Hebr. 8:8, also in O.T.

21 The text of *Baruch* 29:5 reads as follows: "The earth also shall yield its fruit ten thousand-fold and on each vine there shall be a thousand branches, and each branch shall produce a thousand clusters, and each cluster produce a thousand grapes, and each grape produce a cor of wine" (translation of R.H. Charles, in: R.H. Charles (ed.), *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Oxford 1913, vol. II, pp. 497–498).—cf. P. Bogaert, *Apocalypse de Baruch*, Paris 1969, tom. II, p. 64.

he was firmly convinced that he heard in these words the voice of the Lord, who came to him by way of the Presbyters *who had seen and heard* the great disciple of Jesus. Our writer found a written confirmation in the fourth book of Papias, *Logioon Kyriakoon exegeteis*: ταῦτα δὲ καὶ Παπίας ὁ Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστής, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἐταῖρος γεγονώς ἀρχαῖος ἀνὴρ, ἐγγράφως ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ κτλ. (*A.H.* V 33,4). In other words Irenaeus had it by oral *and* written tradition. Eusebius who was, as is well-known, was not very kindly disposed towards Papias,²² took Irenaeus to task for this recommendation, for the bishop of Lyons made a mistake in saying that Papias was a disciple of John whereas Papias himself admitted that he had received it from people who had been acquainted with the apostles: αὐτός γε μὴν ὁ Παπίας κατὰ τὸ προοίμιον τῶν αὐτοῦ λόγων ἀκροατὴν μὲν καὶ αὐτόπτην οὐδαμῶς ἑαυτὸν γενέσθαι τῶν ἱερῶν ἀποστόλων ἐμφαίνει, παρεληφέναι δὲ καὶ τὰ τῆς πίστεως παρὰ τῶν ἐκείνοις γνωρίμων (*Eusebius, Hist. Eccl.* III 39,2; there follows a literal quotation to prove this).

Blum followed in the track of Eusebius and maintained that Irenaeus had falsified the real situation in order to make the line of tradition between himself and the apostolic time as short as possible.²³ He overlooked the fact that Eusebius had a bias against Papias and to a lesser degree, against the bishop of Lyons, because of their chiliastic views, this criticism being most explicit.²⁴ Was Irenaeus in such a need to shorten the chain of tradition? In view of *A.H.* IV 27,1 (see above, p. 251) that is not very likely. Of course the possibility of a mistake on the part of Irenaeus cannot be excluded; he may not have had the book of Papias to hand. But it is also possible without unpermissible harmonization to square the two statements of Papias' prooemium and Irenaeus. We do know very little about the life of Papias. It is feasible that in his youth he had been a "disciple of John" in Ephesus and later moved to Hierapolis to become a bishop. In that time he wrote his book and in his preface he tells his readers that he had tried to collect as many words of the apostles as he could get from his informants. Such things happen, when a man is not writing down what he is taught immediately, but after a period of years. The only question is then: why did not he say that he was a direct disciple of John? So it may be after all that Irenaeus' memory was somewhat confused at this point. But with regard to the transmission of apostolic teaching that did not make much difference in the eyes of Irenaeus and his contemporaries, as we shall see presently.

22 Eusebius, *H.E.* III 39,13 wrote that well-known characteristic of Papias: σφόδρα γάρ τοι σμιαρὸς ὢν τὸν νοῦν.

23 G.G. Blum, *l.c.*, p. 190, nt. 11.

24 Cf. Eusebius, *H.E.* III 39,13 καὶ τοῖς μετ' αὐτὸν πλείστοις ὅσοις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τῆς ὁμοίας αὐτῷ δόξης παραίτιος γέγονε, τὴν ἀρχαιότητα τάνδρὸς προβεβλημένοις ὥσπερ οὖν Εἰρηναίῳ.

The last time the Presbyters are mentioned in *A.H.* is in V 36,1–3 where a piece of eschatological teaching on the differences in degree of blessedness in the Kingdom of God is transmitted. The introduction reads as follows: *quemadmodum Presbyteri dicunt* (§1); it is closed with the words: *hanc esse adordinationem et dispositionem eorum qui salvantur, dicunt Presbyteri Apostolorum discipuli*.

In the *Apodeixis* the Elders are twice mentioned, first in ch. 3: “Now, this is what faith does for us, as the elders, the disciples of the apostles, have handed down to us”,²⁵ that is: the effect of the Christian faith in human life is indicated, and secondly in ch. 61 “the elders say” that it will be at the coming of Christ as was foretold by Isaiah (11:6ff.).²⁶

Finally we turn to that lively and moving letter which Irenaeus wrote to Florinus who had become a follower of the teaching of Valentinus in spite of the fact that formerly he had been so closely attached to Polycarp. Therefore Florinus could know better: ταῦτα τὰ δόγματα οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν πρεσβύτεροι οἱ καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις συμφοιτήσαντες οὐ παρέδωκάν σοι. In a vivid manner Irenaeus recalls the public life of that venerable teacher Polycarp τὴν μετὰ Ἰωάννου συναναστροφὴν ὡς ἀπήγγελλε καὶ τὴν μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν τῶν ἑωρακόντων τὸν κύριον καὶ ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευε τοὺς λόγους αὐτῶν καὶ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου τίνα ἦν ἃ παρ’ ἐκείνων ἀκηκόει . . . ὡς παρὰ τῶν αὐτοπτῶν τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ λόγου παρειληφώς ὁ Πολύκαρπος ἀπήγγελλε πάντα σύμφωνα ταῖς γραφαῖς (ap. Eusebius, *H.E.* V 20,4–6).

In view of our theme we have only copied those passages of this interesting address which are particularly relevant.²⁷ And although this extract is rather extensive, its length is justified by the importance of the information it contains and by the specific wording. So lively is Irenaeus’ description that he makes his readers attend the teaching of the revered bishop Polycarp. This teaching is in complete harmony with the Scriptures and that is a weighty argument in the debate.²⁸ And Polycarp could be relied on as a true witness of the teaching of the apostles, because he had been living with them (συναναστροφή), just as the presbyters had conversed with Jesus’ disciples.²⁹

25 J.P. Smith, *St. Irenaeus, Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*, London 1952, p. 49.

26 J.P. Smith, *L.c.*, p. 88; on the difference of this text with that of *A.H.* V 32 see Smith, *L.c.*, p. 196, nt. 270.

27 This document, so important for our knowledge of Irenaeus as a man and for the relations between “Church and Gnosis” deserves a full commentary, but that falls outside the scope of the present paper.

28 The word *συμφωνία*, cf. also in the opening-sentence *ἀσύμφωνα*, is in pagan, Jewish and Christian literature of the period a very weighty one: when two statements of different authors agree, are in harmony, the truth is established.

29 The undertone may be: “to go to school with”, see Liddell-Scott-Jones, *L.c.*, p. 1687, s.v.

But here the exact wording of Irenaeus is noteworthy. He does not simply say "the disciples of the Lord"; he speaks of the apostles, but later on says: μετὰ τῶν ἑωρακότεων τὸν Κύριον, and calls them "αὐτόπται of the Word of life".

This latter usage reflects as was seen by Lawlor and Oulton,³⁰ the words of 1 John 1:1–3, a letter which was written by the apostle according to Irenaeus (*A.H.* III 16,5.8), but also Luke 1:2 αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται . . . τοῦ λόγου.³¹ It is, however, not a literal quotation of either text. Irenaeus formulates it in his own way; so it is an expression of his own thought, though it has an essential point of contact with the books in which the true witnesses of Jesus' activity speak to later generations. Now there are four stages: 1) the Lord; 2) the apostles, "those who have seen Him" and who spoke; 3) the presbyters, Polycarp who lived with these "eyewitnesses", heard and remembered their words;³² 4) Florinus, Irenaeus and their contemporaries. Full weight is given to the act of "seeing" at stage 2 and to the fact of conversation and hearing in stage 3. These two stages are of vital importance in the line that leads from the Lord to the days of Irenaeus; they span the time between Jesus and the second half of the 2nd century in such a way that Irenaeus is convinced that he possesses completely reliable information about the Lord Jesus which enables him to make an urgent appeal on Florinus. This appeal is based on the fact that Florinus knew the same reliable information, but had exchanged it for he Valentinian fancies' therefore he should return. This appeal is made by a man who is not building up an ecclesiastical theory, "pour besoin de la cause", but is certain that the criteria he uses will be acceptable in the eyes of his addressee. Had Irenaeus just invented some doctrine of tradition, that would have been of little or no avail to him at this moment when he tries to win back his former fellow-student.

The wording of Irenaeus' argument was not accidental. With this document of such a personal character in hand we may look again at that famous text where Irenaeus recalls Polycarp. He does so in the context of the episcopal succession, but his teacher is the only one mentioned by name and his memory is enlivened not only by referring to his letter, but also by some anecdotes. In the famous passage *A.H.* III 3,4 the most relevant words may be singled out: οὐ μόνον ὑπὸ Ἀποστόλων μαθητευθεὶς καὶ συναναστραφεὶς πολλοῖς τοῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἑωρακόσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὸ Ἀποστόλων κατασταθεὶς . . . ἐπίσκοπος, ὃν καὶ

30 H.J. Lawlor – J.E.L. Oulton, *Eusebius, The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine*, London 1927, vol. I, p. 166, nt. 2.

31 References to the preface of St. Luke's Gospel are given by Irenaeus in: *A.H.* III 14,2 and IV peref. 3.

32 N.B. the tense *plusquamperfectum* ἀκήχοει, it still rings in his ears: ἀπεμνημόνευε is imperf. -durative.

ἡμεῖς ἐωράκαμεν³³ . . . ταῦτα διδάξας αἰὶ ᾧ καὶ παρὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἔμαθεν” a man who was of much greater weight and a more steadfast witness of truth (ἄξιοπιστοτέρον καὶ βεβαιότερον ἀληθείας μάρτυρα) than Valentinus, and Marcion, and the rest of the heretics” . . . There are also those who *heard from him* (οἱ ἀκηκοότες αὐτοῦ) that John, the disciple of the Lord” etc. (follows an anecdote about John’s meeting with the heretic Cerinthus, to which is added one about a similar occurrence of a clash between Polycarp and Marcion).—Again the use of the perfect tenses of the verbs is striking here.³⁴ Once more we find here the same chain: a) Apostles who saw the Lord and taught; b) Polycarp learned from them; c) Irenaeus saw the group who had heard that faithful witness.

When we survey this evidence we see that the statements of these presbyters are concerned with certain facts of Jesus’ life and teaching or the apostolic writing, with the study of the Old Testament as Holy Scripture of the Christian Church and with certain eschatological teachings.

These statements are trustworthy for Irenaeus, because they are in conformity with that which the Apostles taught and he is convinced that also his adversaries like his former friend Florinus will accept the words of the presbyters as absolutely true.

Why is that so? The answer is found in the qualifications of these men. In the first place they are called μαθηταί. In his excellent article on this word K.H. Rengstorf has clarified the notions which were connected in the ancient world, both Hellenistic and Jewish, with this idea of discipleship.³⁵ Some fundamental sentences may be quoted here: “Es entspricht dem Ursprung der Jüngergemeinden aus dem Werke des Meisters, dass sie ihm innerlich verpflichtet bleiben und sich dessen bewusst sind . . . dass die vor dem Meister ausgegangen Intentionen bewusst gepflegt werden, und zwar unter sorgfältiger Erhaltung und Weitergabe auch seiner Worte”.³⁶ He speaks in this connection of a “Traditionsprinzip”. When these presbyters are called “disciples of the

33 The words ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικία, ἐπιπολὺ γὰρ παρέμεινε, καὶ πάνυ γηραλέος are also important, because they help to bring to light the *direct* contact of Irenaeus with this older generation in spite of the long time (cf. also p. 256 about the Apostle John).

34 See also my article, mentioned nt. 10.

35 K.H. Rengstorf, μαθητής in: G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Stuttgart 1942, Bd. IV, S. 417–464.

36 K.H. Rengstorf, *l.c.*, S. 426, cf. also S. 440 f.

Apostles", their word was—so everybody knew—a faithful transmission of the teaching of their masters.³⁷

But there is yet another and even more important qualification they possess: they have lived with John the Apostle, *they have seen the other apostles and heard from them*. These disciples of the Lord were "eyewitnesses of the Word of Life" and from them the Presbyters had received their information.

These words were full of meaning to Irenaeus and his contemporaries; it was not just a casual remark and it is a complete misunderstanding of the vocabulary, when this is interpreted as "flüchtig".³⁸ Since up till now this element has never received any, let alone proper, attention in the discussion about the Presbyters, it is worthwhile to see in the light of the usage in Antiquity. For when Irenaeus highlights the fact that these Presbyters *saw and heard* the Apostles, he did not use a category that was peculiar to himself and was foreign to others, but he took over a standard for trustworthiness current in the Hellenistic and Roman world.

The controversy between Irenaeus and the Gnostics was to a certain extent a historical question: what was the teaching of the Apostles of Jesus Christ? That could be decided by their writings, but also by the witness of their disciples who "had seen and heard" them. And Irenaeus makes the gap between his own times and that of the Apostles very small: "John lived till the days of Trajan and his Apocalypse was seen almost in our days".³⁹ Now, in Greek historiography the most important criterion for the veracity of the accounts given was found in the fact that the writer had been an eyewitness.⁴⁰ The author confirms that he had seen it himself, that he had been present. Very often we meet in this connection the combination of "hearing and seeing".

37 They were not direct disciples of Jesus. The questions involved here with regard to the opinion held by Rengstorff concerning the relation of Jesus and His disciples can be left undiscussed in the present context.

38 Th. Zahn, *Apostel und Apostelschüler in der Provinz Asien*, In: *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, Leipzig 1900, VI Teil, S. 73 on Irenaeus, *A.H.* IV 27,1; V 30,1; 33,1 and II 22,5 "welche sämtlich von einer nur gelegentlichen und flüchtigen Berührung mit einem Apostel oder mehreren Aposteln verstanden werden könnten". In the light of Greek usage this is, as we show below, absolutely impossible. See also the perf. ἐωρακώς.

39 Cf. Irenaeus, *A.H.* V 30,3.

40 G. Avenarius, *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung*, Meisenheim-Glan 1956, S. 71–85.—The article of W. Michaelis, ἀπόπτης, in: Kittel-Friedrich, *Theol. Wörterbuch*, Bd. V, S. 373–374 is completely insufficient. The limits set to this paper prevent me from reproducing all texts I have collected to illustrate the usage of this word.

Let me just give a few examples from my collection: Dionysius Hal., *Antic. Rom.* XI 1,3 ἥδεται γὰρ ἡ διανοία πάντος ἀνθρώπου χειραγωγουμένη διὰ τῶν λόγων ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα, καὶ μὴ μόνον ἀκούουσα τῶν λεγομένων ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ πραττόμενα ὁρῶσα.

Dionysius Hal., *Ant. Rom.* V 7,4 μνηστὴς ὦν τ' ἤκουσε καὶ ὦν εἶδε γίνεται.

Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium* 349 ἄξιον δὲ ἐπιμνησθῆναι καὶ ὦν εἶδομέν τε καὶ ἠκούσαμεν.

Aelianus, *De natura animalium* XI 40 ἐγὼ δὲ ὅσα ἐς ἐμὴν ὄψιν τε καὶ ἀκοὴν ἀφίκετο εἶπον.

Longus, *Daphnis et Chloe* II 3,2 ἦκω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅσα εἶδον μνηύσων, ὅσα ἤκουσα ἀπαγγελλῶν.

Herodianus, *Hist.* I 2,5 ἃ δὲ μετὰ τὴν Μάρκου τελευτὴν παρὰ πάντα τὸν ἑαυτοῦ βίον εἶδον τε καὶ ἤκουσα.

Ps. Clemens, *Hom.* I 9,3 Barnabas ἐκτιθέμενον ἃ τε ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐώρακεν τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φανέντα υἱὸν πεποιχέναι τε καὶ εἰρηκέναι.

Dio Cassius, *Hist. Rom.* LXXIII 18,3 παρῶν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ καὶ εἶδον ἕκαστα καὶ ἤκουσα καὶ ἐλάλησα...⁴¹

Interesting is also the riddle Aesop is set to solve in *Vita Aesopi* c. 121–122:⁴² the wise man is asked to show ὃ οὔτε εἶδομεν οὔτε ἠκούσαμεν; when he shows a certain letter the people say: τοῦτον καὶ ἐώρακαμεν καὶ ἀκηκόαμεν πολλάκις and Aesop answers: χαίρω μαρτυρούντων (in connection with the theme of our paper it is superfluous to recount the whole story, but the words cited are sufficient to illustrate the terminology).

But in Hellenistic historiography a further step was made. That is clearly seen in the work of Irenaeus' contemporary Lucianus, *De arte conscribendae historiae* 47: the historian should be very careful in collecting his materials καὶ μάλιστα μὲν παρόντα καὶ ἐφορῶντα εἰ δὲ μὴ, τοῖς ἀδεκαστότερον ἐξηγουμένοις προσέχοντα καὶ οὓς εἰκάσειεν ἂν τις ἦκιστα πρὸς χάριν ἢ ἀπέχθειαν ἀφαιρήσειν ἢ προσθήσειν⁴³ τοῖς γεγονόσι. In other words: he should base his account on personal acquaintance or on the evidence of faithful, unbiased witnesses. This rule reflects a conception, generally held by Hellenistic historians and going back to the famous preface of Thucydides. *Hist.* I 22,2: back to the famous

41 The texts from the New Testament, when this combination is used are mentioned and briefly discussed in my public lecture address: *Oog en Oor, criteria voor de eerste samenstelling van het Nieuwe Testament*, Utrecht 1973.

42 Text in A.M. Denis, *Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt graeca*, Leiden 1970, pp. 146–147.

43 For this formula see my article: *De la règle Μῆτε πρόσθεσθαι μῆτε ἀφελεῖν dans l'histoire du Cannon*, in: *Vigiliae Christianae* III (1949), pp. 1–36.

preface of Thucydides, *Hist.* I 22,2: οἷς τε αὐτὸς παρήν καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσον δυνατὸν ἀκριβεῖα περὶ ἐκάστου ἐπεξελδών.

See also Polybius, *Hist.* XV 36,9 οἷς ἂν αὐτοὶ παρατυχόντες ἐγκυρήσωσιν ἢ πυθόμενοι παρὰ τινων πρὸς αὐτὰ ταῦτα.

Dionysius Hal., *De Thucyd.* 6 οἷς μὲν αὐτὸς παρήν, ἐξ ἐμπειρίας, ὧν δ' ἀπελείφθη διὰ τὴν φυγὴν παρὰ τῶν ἄριστα γινωσκόντων πυνθανόμενος.

Diodorus Siculus, *Hist. Gen.* I 39 on his predecessor Ephorus μὴ θεαμένος τὴν φύσιν τῶν κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον τόπων ἀλλὰ μηδὲ παρὰ τῶν εἰδόντων . . . ἐπιμελῶς πεπυσμένος.

Strabo, *Geogr.* XI 6,3 ἂ μηδέποτε εἶδον μηδὲ ἤκουσαν ἢ παρὰ γε εἰδόντων . . .

Pausanias, *Descr. Graeca* IV 31,5 οὔτε εἶδον οὔτε ἄλλων περὶ αὐτῶν ἤκουσα αὐτοποτούντων.

Though many more testimonies can be adduced,⁴⁴ these will, I think be sufficient, the more so because they are taken from authors of great authority. According to this Hellenistic rule the historian could be relied upon, if he had been present himself at the events he described or had received his information from people who had been eyewitnesses and could be trusted.

According to the standard formulated in the texts we reproduced Irenaeus' position was completely safe. The Presbyters *had seen and heard* the Apostles; so their information was reliable. In some cases when they made certain statements about Jesus, they had received them from the Apostles and disciples who *had seen and heard* the Lord; in other cases their acquaintance with the Apostles was a guarantee that they faithfully transmitted what the Apostles had taught.

In the latter half of the 2nd century this rule could still be in operation in certain cases, as in that of Irenaeus without causing objections or offence.

Irenaeus did not invent this theory of tradition nor was it an idea thought out by Christians. He simply accepted what everybody in the world around him considered a safe way to reliable historical evidence; he applied it to the case of Jesus and His apostles and to the next generation between the days of apostles and his own age. Because it was generally accepted he could make this appeal to Florinus and most effectively argue against the Gnostics.⁴⁵

44 Very interesting in this respect is Josephus; see my paper: *Once more St. Luke's prologue*, to be published in *Neotestamentica, Annual Publication of Die Nuwe-Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap van Suid-Afrika*.

45 We must return here to the question concerning those men whom Irenaeus calls "superior to himself", but unfortunately does not mention by name. He (or they) wrote against the Gnostics. In that connection neither the word "disciple" nor the combination of

The vocabulary of Irenaeus leads us to this vantage-point in his own world.⁴⁶ It is from this point that we must examine his position and not measure it by other, later standards. Since this notion, so fundamental for this church-father, had been overlooked or set aside of little or no value, it seemed highly important to give his terminology its full force in the light of Greek usage and not to encumber this paper with discussions with other scholars.⁴⁷ I know that my friend in whose honour this contribution is written, prefers positive exposition to polemics. May this study of a certain, but important aspect of the Christian tradition bring him joy.

“seeing and hearing” is used. Since this paper tried to elucidate these terms, there was no need to deal with this question in detail. Let me just quote an interesting parallel in Plato, *Philebus* 16 c where Socrates is saying: οἱ μὲν παλαιοί, κρείττονες ἡμῶν καὶ ἐγγυτέρω θεῶν οἰκοῦντες. Is Irenaeus reflecting such a usage? At any rate though this man (these men) had a certain, unmistakable authority for Irenaeus, no claim is made for direct contact with the Apostles.

46 In the writings of Clement of Alexandria also mention is made of “presbyters”, but that father did not use the combination of “seeing and hearing the Apostles” with regard to them. Hence no discussion of them has been included in this contribution.

47 In my address, mentioned in nt. 41 the relevance of this specific terminology for the problem of the initial stages in the formation of the New Testament Canon has been shown.

Two Notes on Irenaeus

I Irenaeus and Atticus Platonicus

In combatting his adversaries, e.g. Marcion, who made an absolute division between the good God and the just God, Irenaeus cites Plato in support, because he had a much better conception of God, as being at the same time just and good: *Adv. Haer.* 3,25,5 *quibus religiosior Plato ostenditur, qui eundem Deum et iustum et bonum confessus est.* In order to confirm this statement Irenaeus makes two quotations from Plato: a) under the heading (Deum) *habentem potestatem omnium, ipsum facientem iudicium* a passage of *Leg.* IV 715e–716a: ὁ μὲν δὴ θεός, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ παλαιὸς λόγος, ἀρχὴν τε καὶ τελευτὴν καὶ μέσα τῶν ὄντων ἀπάντων ἔχων εὐθείᾳ περαίνει κατὰ φύσιν περιπορευόμενος. τῷ δὲ αἰεὶ συνέπεται δίκη τῶν ἀπολειπομένων τοῦ θεοῦ νόμου τιμωρός.—b) under the heading *factorem et fabricatorem huius universitatis bonum* the words of *Timaeus* 29e about the Demiurge ἀγαθῷ οὐδείς περὶ οὐδένοιο οὐδέποτε φθόνος.

These two references are connected with each other by the words: *et iterum... ostendit.* This way of combining two quotations καὶ πάλιν (= *et iterum*) is typical, though not a peculiarity of Irenaeus. It is familiar from the New Testament (see e.g. Joh. 12,39. 19,37; Rom. 15,10–12; Hebr. 1,5), but also found in Greek pagan authors.¹ It is the technique of buttressing one idea by several quotations.

These two passages from Plato serve Irenaeus' purpose very well, because they show how the revered teacher saw the two qualities of justice and goodness in this one God.² They are very suitable for refuting his opponents. But at the same time it is very interesting to see that Irenaeus was not the first or the only author in antiquity to make use of these texts.

It is well-known that this particular quotation from the *Laws* was very popular in later antiquity. The most complete collection of references in which Irenaeus is not missing was brought together by E. des Places in an extensive footnote to his edition of the *Laws*.³ It is a very long series. In my study on the

1 See W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur* (Berlin ⁵1958) Sp. 1203; the number of examples can easily be expanded.

2 According to Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium* 1,19, it was a matter of dispute among the Platonists whether the Master had taught monotheism or polytheism. The text of *Leg.* IV 715e–716a serves there as a testimony for the former option.

3 E. des Places, *Platon, Les Lois* I 2 (Budé-series) p. 65, n. 2–p. 66.

predicate “the Beginning and the End” as applied to God⁴ I have discussed a number of these texts dating from the first three centuries of the Christian era. Whereas Des Places and his predecessors⁵ were exclusively interested in the textcritical value of these testimonies, I have directed my attention to the exegetical question: what meaning and application were given to these words of Plato by these later students? As far as Irenaeus is concerned the answer to this question is quite evident; he found here a proof-text for God’s justice.

With regard to the latter text, that of the *Timaeus*, we may cite the dictum of Dörrie: “es ist das eine jener Wanderstellen, die zum festen Besitz aller Platoniker und darüberhinaus vieler Gebildeter geworden waren.”⁶ This work of Plato was, as is well-known, a favorite text-book for philosophers and theologians in the imperial period. The wider context of the use made by Irenaeus of this text was dealt with by the present writer elsewhere.⁷

Now the question may be raised of whether Irenaeus made these quotations from Plato on the basis of his own reading or took them from elsewhere. The former part of this alternative is rather improbable, even on general consideration.

Very little is known about his youth and schooling. So he may or may not have read Plato. But it is a clear fact that in his remaining works he betrays little knowledge of the great philosopher who enjoyed a great popularity in the second century, also in Asia Minor. If we compare Irenaeus’ literary output with that of other Christian authors of the same age it is striking that he mentions Plato not more than three times.

Besides the passage we are discussing here there are only two more where explicit reference to Plato is made, however without a direct quotation. The first is found in *A.H.* 2,14,3–4, where Irenaeus attacks his gnostic opponents for deriving their teachings from Greek philosophers (cf. §2: *apud omnes, qui Deum ignorant et qui dicuntur philosophi*). The present purpose does not require a detailed analysis of the charges made there. Let it be sufficient to quote the relevant sentences: *Quod autem dicunt imagines esse haec* (sc. *extra*

4 This study will appear under the title: Het Godspraedicaat “Het Begin en het Einde” bij Flavius Josephus en in de Openbaring van Johannes, in: *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen* (Amsterdam 1975).

5 Cf. E. des Places, La tradition indirecte des Lois de Platon (Livres I–VI), in: *Mélanges J. Saunier* (Lyon 1944) 34–35.

6 H. Dörrie, Was ist “spätantiker Platonismus”? *Theologische Rundschau* 36 (1971) 294.

7 W.C. van Unnik, De ἀφθονία van God in de oud-christelijke literatuur, *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen*, Nieuwe Serie, deel 36 (Amsterdam 1973).

Pleroma) *eorum quae sunt, rursus manifestissime Democriti et Platonis sententiam edisserunt... Plato vero rursus materiam dicit et exemplum et Deum... 4 Et hoc autem quod ex subiecta materia dicunt fabricatorem fecisse mundum, et Anaxagoras et Empedocles et Plato primi ante hos dixerunt.* In reading the whole section from which these sentences are taken, it becomes abundantly clear that Irenaeus is dependent upon doxographical material. With regard to the statement *materiam dicit* etc. Grabe⁸ has already referred to Apuleius, *De Platone et eius dogmate* 1,5 (ed. Thomas, p. 86): *Initia rerum tria arbitratur Plato, Deum et materiam rerumque formas quas ἰδέας idem vocat*, and Ps. Justinus, *Coh. ad Gentiles* 6: τοῦ γὰρ Πλάτωνος τρεῖς ἀρχαὶ τοῦ παντὸς εἶναι λέγοντος, θεὸν καὶ ὕλην καὶ εἶδος. See also Hippolytus, *Refut.* 1,19,1 the opening-sentence of a section of which P. Wendland said: “zugrunde liegt ein Compendium der platonischen Lehre”:⁹ Πλάτων ἀρχαὶ εἶναι τοῦ παντὸς θεὸν καὶ ὕλην καὶ παράδειγμα, which comes even closer in wording to Irenaeus’ terminology.¹⁰

The sentence of § 4 is also formed according to the pattern of doxographies. As far as the part of Plato in it is concerned, that can also be illustrated from these same sources; cf. Hippolytus, *Ref.* 1,19,1: Θεὸν μὲν τὸν ποιητὴν καὶ διακοσμήσαντα τόδε τὸ πᾶν... ὕλην δὲ τὴν πᾶσιν ὑποκειμένην... ἐξ ἧς διακοσμηθείσης γενέσθαι... τὰ τέσσαρα στοιχεῖα, Albinus, *Epitome* 8,2: ταύτην (ὕλην)... ὀνομάζει (sc. Plato) καὶ ὑποκείμενον, and 12,1: ἐκ τῆς πάσης οὖν ὕλην αὐτὸν (sc. κόσμον) ἐδημιούργει.

These parallels with their identical phrases confirm the opinion that Irenaeus derived his statements about Plato from a doxographical tradition and not from Plato himself.

The second passage is found in Irenaeus’ attack on the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, viz. *A.H.* 2,33,2: *Ad haec Plato vetus ille Atheniensis, qui et primus sententiam hanc introduxit*,¹¹ *cum excusare non posset, oblivionis induerit poculum, putans se per hoc aporiam effugere: ostensionem quidem*

8 In A. Stieren, *Sancti Irenaei... quae supersunt omnia*, vol. II *Apparatus ad opera sancti Irenaei* (Lipsiae 1853) 783.

9 Cf. the apparatus of Paul Wendland in his edition of Hippolytus, *Refutatio* (Leipzig 1916) 19, where references to other texts are also given.

10 Interesting is the remark of Hippolytus, *Refut.* 1,19,2: τὸ δὲ παράδειγμα τὴν διάνοιαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι, ὁ καὶ ἰδέαν καλεῖ οἷον εἰκόνισμά τι ᾧ προσέχων ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ ὁ θεὸς τὰ πάντα ἐδημιούργει.

11 Cf. here the extensive note of W.W. Harvey, *Sancti Irenaei... libros quinque adversus Haereses* (Cambridge 1857) I,377–378, who is correct in pointing out that the teaching of the metempsychosis in Greek philosophy was much older than Plato.—Stieren, *l.c.*, II, 840–841 reproduces the words of R. Massuet who was inclined to emend the text by deleting the words: *qui et* and *introduxit*, because “si arctius premanetur haec Irenaei verba, vix a lapsu liberari poterit”. But this difficulty can be solved in another way.

nullam faciens, dogmatice autem respondens.—Irenaeus refutes Plato's opinion by showing the difficulties he encounters; and also by putting the mocking question: "how, O Plato, dost thou obtain the knowledge of this fact (since thy soul is now in the body), that, before it entered into the body, it was made to drink by the demon a drug which caused oblivion?" (translation of A. Roberts, in: *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, vol. V, p. 248).—For our present purpose we can dispense with a detailed discussion of the topic itself and of Irenaeus' refutation.¹² For the moment we limit ourselves to the relation of the Church-father to Plato. It is obvious and remarkable that he ascribes to Plato as the first philosopher the doctrine of the metempsychosis, but that he has no specific quotation to demonstrate this. It is also striking that Irenaeus has made a "mistake" in his historical remark. This fact may be an indication that Irenaeus did not depend upon a comprehensive Doxography, but that he used either the works of Plato himself or a handbook from the Platonic school, which first set forth the opinion of the Master and then those of his followers (and so Plato would be the first). It is clear that Irenaeus is referring here to the final passage of Plato's myth of Er (*Republ.* X 620e–621a; for the words: *ab eo qui est super introitum daemona*, cf. 620e: [Lachesis] ἐκάστω ὃν εἴλετο δαίμονα, τοῦτον φύλακα συμπέμπειν τοῦ βίου καὶ ἀποπληρωτὴν τῶν αἰρεθέντων, for *oblivionis poculum* cf. 621a: in the valley of Lethe, the souls encamp there near the river of Unmindfulness ; μέτρον μὲν οὖν τι τοῦ ὕδατος πᾶσιν ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι πιεῖν). Because Plato expresses his thoughts here in the form of a myth, he does not give an *ostensio*, but speaks *dogmatice*. The question of whether Irenaeus' source was Plato himself or a Platonic compendium is hard to decide. But I am inclined to think that he got it from some handbook in which the teaching of Plato on soul and body was summarized with a statement on the transmigration of the souls and the drinking of the cup of oblivion.¹³ I am led to this view by the fact that Irenaeus tries to show that Plato is contradicting himself,¹⁴ whereas the Athenian philosopher in fact gives a clear answer to the question what was the source of his knowledge, namely the adventures of

12 For the discussion of the metempsychosis in patristic sources and Irenaeus' contribution see the comments of J.H. Waszink, *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani De Anima* (Amsterdam 1947) 306–307.

13 J.H. Waszink, *L.c.*, 41*–44* and 304–306 has argued that Tertullian used a lost work of the Platonist Albinus in his discussion and refutation of the Platonic doctrine of reminiscence. This may offer an analogy to the work of Irenaeus, though this father follows a different line.

14 See the words of Irenaeus in *A.H.* 2,33,3, following the question quoted in the text and concluding that paragraph: "For if thou hast a remembrance of the demon, and the cup, and the entrance (into life), thou oughtest also to be acquainted with other things; but

Er. Had Irenaeus known the beginning and the end of that myth, he would have found the solution. But since he puts that pertinent question to Plato himself, he was unaware of that answer. This lack of knowledge leads in the direction of assuming that Irenaeus did read in his source only an abstract from the myth. However that may be, it is crystal-clear that the views of Plato on this point are completely rejected by the bishop of Lyons.

The comparison of these passages where Irenaeus mentions Plato by name and refers to his teaching reveals a remarkable difference. In the second book of *Adv. Haer.* Plato's views are completely rejected; he is even considered as one of those philosophers who did not know God and were mistaken in their conceptions. In passing we may ask if this attitude of Irenaeus has been sufficiently accounted for in discussions of the "Hellenization of Christianity". At any rate in rejecting the views of Plato, Irenaeus cuts at the roots of some Gnostic schools, for in following the erring Plato they were also erring. But in the third book he has a better opinion of the Athenian philosopher and he plays him off as a witness against his opponents. Has the church-father changed his mind in the meantime? Or should we say that he had found another chapter in a philosophical handbook which better suited his purpose? It may be that from this comparison a new light falls upon that expression of his, viz. *religiosior*. Then it is as though Irenaeus is saying: well, notwithstanding the fact that Plato did not know God, at this point at least he expressed ideas that are more in accordance with religious truth, much better than these Gnostics and Marcion.

Is Irenaeus also in this case reproducing a doxographical handbook? The answer to this question may be found by adducing a curious parallel which has been overlooked so far. The text we have in view is missing in the list of Des Places and I myself did not mention it either in the discussion of the *aphthonia* of God. It is found in the fragments of the philosopher Atticos, which have been preserved by Eusebius in his *Praeparatio Evangelica*.¹⁵

This Atticos lived in the second half of the second century.¹⁶ According to his own testimony he was a Greek, a fellower of Plato's philosophy.¹⁷ With all probability he taught in Athens, where at that time various philosophical schools

if, on the other hand thou art ignorant of them, then there is no truth in the story of the demon, nor in the cup of oblivion prepared with art" (translation by A. Roberts, *LL*, 248).

15 The parallelism is also left unnoticed by J. Daniélou, *Message évangélique et culture hellénistique au II^e et III^e siècles* (Tournai 1961) 108–109, though he mentions there in the same paragraph both Irenaeus and Atticos.

16 J. Baudry, *Atticos, fragments de son œuvre* (Paris 1931) III–IV.

17 Atticos, fr. 4, *ap.* Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 15,6,3: . . . εἰ περὶ τῶν δοκούντων Πλάτωνι πιστεύομεν οἷς αὐτὸς Ἕλληνα ὦν πρὸς Ἕλληνας ἡμᾶς σαφεῖ καὶ τρανῶ τῷ στόματι διείλεκται.

were offering their teachings and lived in rivalry. Baudry, who published and studied the remaining fragments of Atticos' writings, gave this characteristic: "Atticos fut l'un de ces philosophes les plus remarquables. Représentant et probablement chef de l'école platonicienne, il dut jouir en son temps d'une grande autorité."¹⁸

The relevant passage from his book on *Pronoia* is found in Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 15,5,2 (Baudry, fr. 3, p. 10). The bishop of Caesarea points out that Moses and the Hebrew prophets, just as Plato, clearly showed that God's providence is concerned with the universe in its totality, whereas Aristotle limited it to the world beyond the moon and left the rest outside God's government. In this discussion, he finds a welcome supporter of his view in Atticos, who was a strong opponent of the Peripatetic philosophy.¹⁹

The fragment in question starts by pointing out that according to Plato belief in *Pronoia* is the best way to happiness and the best guide to righteous life for men. After a quotation from Pindar²⁰ it continues as follows: ὁ μὲν Πλάτων εἰς θεὸν καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ πάντα ἀνάπτει. φησὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἀρχὴν τε καὶ μέσα καὶ τελευτήν τῶν ὄντων ἅπαντων ἔχοντα εὐθείᾳ περαίνειν περιπορευόμενον. καὶ αὖ πάλιν φησὶν αὐτὸν ἀγαθὸν εἶναι, ἀγαθῷ δὲ μηδένᾳ φθόνον ἐγγίγνεσθαι περὶ μηδενός τούτο δ' ἐκτὸς ὄντα πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα ἀγαθὰ ποιεῖν, εἰς τάξιν ἄγοντα ἐκ τῆς ἀταξίας. In other words: Atticos quotes from Plato, *Leg.* IV 715e–716a²¹ and *Tim.* 29e + 30a (somewhat free).

The striking parallelism with Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 3,25,5 leaps to the eye. Both these authors, who are more or less contemporaries, bring the same texts from Plato and do so in exactly the same order, while combining them in the very same way: καὶ αὖ πάλιν—*et iterum* (see before, p. 201). Of course there are some differences. Atticos has made a transposition by changing the independent sentences to dependent ones (*nominativus* + *indicativus* > *accusativus cum infinitivo*), whereas the text of Irenaeus is in conformity with the original. Besides that, Irenaeus' quotation from the *Leges* is somewhat longer than that of Atticus (add.: τῷ δὲ αἰ—τιμωρός); the latter adds to the words of *Tim.* 29e

18 J. Baudry, *LL*, V.

19 J. Baudry, *LL*, XXXII–XLIX in a long chapter under the title: "Atticos polémiste, adversaire d'Aristote."

20 Pindarus, fragm. 213, quoted by Plato, *Rep.* 365b and see the note in the critical apparatus of K. Mras in his edition of Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* (Berlin 1956) II, 356.

21 There is, as everyone can see, a slight difference in word-order, because the words τελευτήν and μέσα have changed places. Atticos following the more "logical" order; this has also happened in other texts, for which see my study, mentioned before note 4.—J. Baudry, *LL*, 10 did not mention the parallel in Irenaeus.

about the goodness of God a summary of the sequel,²² while the former has only the words ἀγαθός ἦν—φθόνος.

These textual varieties are easily explained by the differences in purpose and setting in both authors. Irenaeus wanted to show Plato's knowledge of God who judges the world; hence he could not miss the word about δίκη—τιμωρός, whereas for Atticos the extension of God's reign was of prime importance. On the other hand that single sentence about the God who is good without grudging was sufficient for the bishop, whereas to the philosopher in his demonstration of God's *Pronoia* the words εἰς τάξιν ἄγοντα ἐκ τῆς ἀταξίας²³ were absolutely indispensable. Nevertheless, if we take into account these varieties and their good reason, the parallelism is most striking, particularly the combination of the two texts. One may even say that against the background of these differences the agreement is the more apparent. This coincidence cannot be accidental.

It goes without saying that the possibility of direct dependence of one author upon the other is excluded in this case. So the only possible explanation of the similarity is this: that both Atticos and Irenaeus made use of the same collection of prooftexts from "the most holy Plato", as Philo calls him.²⁴ That is to say: because the texts of these two authors are similar, but not identical, two versions at least of the same book must have been in circulation.

Have we here the traces of a Plato-florilegium? Waszink is sceptical about this matter, because, he says, "as far as my knowledge goes, nobody has as yet succeeded in recovering a clear specimen".²⁵ Henry Chadwick, however, in his article "Florilegium" thinks that together with doxographies and handbooks

22 The complete text of Plato, *Tim.* 29e–30a reads as follows: τούτου δ' ἐκτὸς ὧν πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα ἐβουλήθη γενέσθαι παραπλήσια ἑαυτῷ. Ταύτην δὲ γενέσεως καὶ κόσμου μάλιστ' ἂν τις ἀρχὴν κυριωτάτην παρ' ἀνδρῶν φρονίμων ἀποδεχόμενος ὁρθότατα ἀποδέχοιτ' ἄν. Βουλευθεὶς γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀγαθὰ μὲν πάντα, φλαῦρον δὲ μηδὲν εἶναι κατὰ δύναμιν, οὕτω δὴ πᾶν ὅσον ἦν ὁρατὸν παραλαβὼν οὐχ ἡσυχίαν ἄγον ἀλλὰ κινούμενον πλημμελῶς καὶ ἀτάκτως, εἰς τάξιν αὐτὸ ἤγαγεν ἐκ τῆς ἀταξίας.

23 A literal quotation of these words is also found in Albinus, *Epitome* 12,2 and 13,3.

24 Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber* 2,13; cf. Cicero, *Tusc.* 1,79: *Panaetius Platonem omnibus locis divinum, sapientissimum, sanctissimum, Homerum philosophorum appellat*, and *De Natura Deorum* 2,32: *quasi quendam deum philosophorum*.

25 J.H. Waszink, Some observations on the appreciation of "the philosophy of the barbarians" in early Christian literature, in: *Mélanges Christine Mohrmann* (Utrecht-Anvers 1963) 42; his conclusion is "that the study of handbooks (of Platonist doctrine like Albinus, *Epitome*) . . . was combined with the reading of entire dialogues of Plato, at all events of the primarily 'theological' ones which in the period discussed were the most popular" (*LL.*, 42).

“auch kurze Zusammenfassungen in Umlauf gewesen sein (können), in denen die einflussreichsten Platotexte über Gott, die Seele u. das Wesen des Kosmos vereinigt waren”;²⁶ in other words: the existence of such a florilegium is a possibility and a probability, but not a clear fact.

Now, if we had nothing but the fragment of Atticos, I would agree with Waszink. It is a matter of course that this teacher read the writings of Plato and had not to depend on abstracts. Moreover, the last part of his testimony from *Tim.* 29e–30a is clear evidence that Atticos himself has been at work by abbreviating and reformulating the text of Plato, by leaving out what was irrelevant for his immediate purpose. On the other hand, we may say that the two quotations in the beginning are almost literal with only those changes that were made necessary by Atticus’ introductory formula *φησί*; it is as though he is recalling two well-known phrases of the Master. They might have come from his own reading but for the combination, sequence and above all the parallelism with Irenaeus. And it is precisely this last point which makes us think of a florilegium.

We observed that also in the other places of the *Adversus Haereses* where Plato is cited, there are clear indications that Irenaeus uses doxographical material (see p. 203). There is not the slightest indication that he has studied the works of Plato. Yet there is that remarkable parallelism with Atticos. This can only be explained by assuming, that he had to hand a piece of paper with the heading: *Platoon peri Theou*, a collection of prooftexts that could serve various purposes and that could easily be expanded, if need be, by somebody familiar with Plato’s dialogues like Atticos.

We may put the question why Irenaeus did not utilize it on other occasions as well to confute his Gnostic adversaries. The answer is a secret which died with the bishop, for he did not render account for his method as an author. But from the way he mentions Plato in the second book (see p. 203) we may infer that he had his serious doubts about the philosopher as a religious guide. In that respect he stands apart from other early Christian writers, who loved to show the agreement between the words of Moses and the prophets and those of Plato. For Irenaeus the Greek philosopher belonged to the pagans who did not know God and the way in which some Gnostics employed Greek philosophy could not make him think more favourably.

26 H. Chadwick, art. Florilegium, *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, VII (Stuttgart 1969) 114,2; he refers to J. Daniélou, *LL.*, 103 ff.

II Ireneaus on Clemens Romanus

One of the most famous sections of Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* is that of 3, 3, 1–3 in which he gives the succession of the bishops in Rome from the days of its foundation by the apostles Peter and Paul to his own day. In that way could be given *plenissima haec ostensio unam et eandem vivificatricem fidem esse quae in ecclesia ab apostolis usque nunc sit conservata et tradita in veritate*. It is not the purpose of this short note to give yet another contribution to the well-known controversy about this Roman succession, but to discuss a particular aspect of Irenaeus' vocabulary and argument in this passage.

Twelve names are mentioned in this list, nine of which are nothing but names. Three men get a special mention: the first one Linus because he is identified with the person of that name, who parades in a group of people whose greetings are recorded in 2 Timothy 4,21, and number seven Telesphorus, because he was a martyr; but pride of place is given to the third man in the succession, Clemens, for about half of the whole section is devoted to him. In a literal sense he is the most outstanding personality in this document. It is a matter of course that Clement owed this exceptional distinction to the fact that in his days²⁷ the Roman church wrote an important letter to the Corinthian church in the time of crisis.²⁸ It is easily understood that Irenaeus was all too happy to have this written testimony from this time as a powerful weapon in his refutation of the Gnostics. And he did so not without good reason. There is no need to discuss here the relation of this summary to the actual letter, since that has already been done by Botte.²⁹ But there are two more points in Irenaeus' account that call for comments: because they give a special note to this bishop Clement and this writing.

First of all we notice the interesting characterization of Clement, because it is used only of him and not even of his predecessors: ὁ καὶ ἐωρακῶς τοὺς μακαρίους ἀποστόλους καὶ συμβεβληκῶς αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔτι ἔναυλον τὸ κήρυγμα τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τὴν παράδοσιν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἔχων. It is typical that Irenaeus did not refer as he did in the case of Linus, to one of the Pauline letters. He could have done so very easily by pointing to Philippians 4,3,³⁰ an epistle which he

27 For this translation of ἐπὶ τούτου see W. Bauer, *Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, 567.

28 Irenaeus does not say that the letter was written by Clement, but by the church in Rome.

29 B. Botte, Saint Irénée et l'Épître de Clément, *Revue des études augustiniennes* 2 (1956) 67–70.

30 Philipp. 4,3: "they have laboured side by side with me in the gospel together with Clement and the rest of my fellow-workers."—This identification was made by Origen, *In Johannem*

uses at various places. But he preferred a different characteristic. Why? Only for reasons of variation? Or did he want to underline a fact other than just a casual reference and bring to light why Clement is such a valuable witness?

In the first place Irenaeus says that Clement “has seen the blessed apostles”. This can be a reference to 1 *Clem.* 5,3 λάβωμεν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἡμῶν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἀποστόλους, which is explained and expanded by the two examples of Peter and Paul. But in the course of the argument of 1 Clement it is not certain that this clause does express direct, personal acquaintance, because the writer mentions these “modern” victims of “jealousy and strife” side by side with those of the Old Testament and the words πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν λαμβάνειν may have a more spiritual meaning: “to be mindful of . . .”³¹ But Irenaeus lays stress on the personal contact of Clement with the apostles. The verb “he has seen” is not just a casual remark about seeing at a distance, but its perfect tense expresses a lasting effect.³² This is strengthened by the following term συμβεβληκῶς αὐτοῖς which Irenaeus also used of the “presbyters” in Asia: οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν Ἰωάννη τῷ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῇ συμβεβληκότες (*Adv. Haer.* 2,22,5). The sense is clear, for συμβάλλω means “to come in contact”;³³ since the perfect tense is used it is said that these presbyters lived in close contact with John³⁴ and therefore could give a trustworthy testimony to the statement Irenaeus is making.³⁵ In the same way it is said of Clement that he had not only seen the apostles, but had also conversed with them.

To this Irenaeus adds that in Clement’s ears still resounded the preaching of the apostles and that he had their *paradosis* before his eyes. For the argument of Irenaeus this is a most important fact: Clement had heard the preaching of the apostles and it was still in and around him, when he wrote his letter and put the *paradosis* in writing (see the words somewhat later: *ex ipsa scriptura qui velint discere possunt et apostolicam ecclesiae traditionem intelligere*). So when he heard this preaching, it did not go in one ear and out of the other;

6,54,279; Eusebius, *H.E.* 3,15; Hieronymus, *De viris illustribus* 15; Epiphanius, *Panarion* 27,6,2 however makes a mistake, saying that Clement is mentioned in Paul’s Epistle to the Romans.

31 Cf. the references in W. Bauer, *LL*, 1189 and also Irenaeus’ own words: τὴν παράδοσιν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἔχων.

32 F. Blass – A. Debrunner – R.W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature* (Cambridge 1961) §342,2.

33 H.G. Liddell – R. Scott – H. Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford 1940) 1675, s.v. II 4.

34 See the variant readings in W.W. Harvey, *Sancti Irenaei... Libros quinque adversus Haereses* (Cambridge 1857) I, 331, nt. 2: συμβεβηκότες—συμβεβιωκότες.

35 I deal with this point more in detail in my forthcoming article: *The Authority of the Presbyters in Irenaeus’ works*.

but he kept it and passed it on himself. According to Irenaeus Clement had seen and heard the apostles. Is this nothing but a (quasi)-historical intimation? Why does it seem to be so highly valued by our author? He had the letter of that church in his hands; was that not sufficient? Indeed, it offers a clear testimony to the apostolic *paradosis* precisely because it had been written under *that* bishop and he could guarantee the truth, because he had *seen and heard* the apostles.

This qualification was conclusive proof for readers in the ancient world. Since the days of Thucydides the essential requirement for a faithful historian was to be an eyewitness of the events he described. The combination of seeing and hearing is often found in antiquity among non-Christians and Christians alike to state the truth. A man who had “seen and heard” something could give evidence that was unimpeachable.³⁶ In other cases too, this way of arguing is used by Irenaeus.³⁷ So if he applies this rule in the case of Clement, his position was according to a generally accepted conception unassailable.

The second point in this passage that calls for comment has also to do with the way in which Irenaeus buttresses his argument. At the end of the paragraph on Clement he says: *cum sit vetustior epistula his qui nunc false docent*. In a different context, Irenaeus uses the same proof somewhat later, cf. *Adv. Haer.* 3,4,2–3: *per illam veterem apostolorum traditionem ne in conceptionem quidem mentis admittunt* (sc. *barbari christiani*) *quodcumque horum portentilorum quium est. Neque*³⁸ *enim congregatio fuit apud eos neque doctrina instituta. Ante Valentinum enim non fuerunt qui sunt a Valentino, neque ante Marcionem erant qui sunt a Marcione*, etc. and then he continues to give the time in which these heretics lived, viz. under the bishops Hyginus, Pius and Anicetus, in the middle of the second century. The underlying thought here is that what is older is more reliable, what is in terms of chronology nearer to the apostles has better preserved their teachings.

This way of arguing was not made by Irenaeus *pour besoin de la cause*. He could make use of it, because it expresses an idea generally shared in antiquity: what is older is better. Cf. the statement of Fronto, ed. Naber, p. 162: *vulgo dicitur quod potius sit antiquius esse*. Jamblichus has Pythagoras say: *μᾶλλον τὸ προηγούμενον ἢ τὸ τῷ χρόνῳ ἐπόμενον* (*Vita Pyth.* 37; cf. the saying attributed to

36 See the material in my lecture: *Oog en Oor, criteria voor de eerste samenstelling van het Nieuwe Testament*, Rede ter gelegenheid van de 337e Dies Natalis der Rijks-universiteit te Utrecht (Utrecht 1973) 9 ff.

37 See the article, mentioned in n. 35.

38 For this division see the note of F. Sagnard, *Irénée de Lyon, Contre les Hérésies, livre III* (Paris 1952) 119, n. 1.

Pythagoras in Diogenes Laertius 8,22: τὸ προηγούμενον τῷ χρόνῳ τιμιώτερον). Whether this idea stems from Pythagoras or not,³⁹ is a question that is not our present concern. At any rate it is a generally accepted notion in antiquity.⁴⁰ And it is well-known how Jewish and Christian apologists tried to prove the superiority of Moses and the Hebrew prophets by appealing to the fact that they preceded the Greek lawgivers and philosophers in time (see e.g. Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, passim, and Ps. Justinus, *Coh. ad Graecos*, passim).

In the succession of bishops in Rome, Clement is so valuable a witness for the apostolic tradition, because both his person and the letter that was written in his time were marked by characteristics that according to the standards of the time were conclusive proof for the truth to which they testified. The link between this person and this letter of the Roman church is made by the fact that this Clement was not the only disciple of the Apostles: ἔτι γὰρ πολλοὶ ὑπελείποντο τότε ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων δεδιδαγμένοι (note again here the perfect tense: they had once been taught by the Apostles and now possessed that teaching!). The source of this statement is not revealed. Was it a guess of Irenaeus from probability; or had he information about this point from Roman circles which he had gathered during his visit?⁴¹ However this may be, Irenaeus appealed to it and considered it irrefutable. In this way the link in the chain of tradition was not thin, just one person; but very strong indeed: πολλοί.⁴² And at the same time he had written evidence in the letter of the Roman Church. The inscriptio: ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην, was in this way very handsomely used to strengthen the point Irenaeus is making.

In this way I hope to have shown that the manner of speech in this passage was carefully chosen and could fulfil its purpose, viz. to make Irenaeus' case successful in refuting the heretics by applying standards of truth generally accepted in antiquity.

39 C.J. de Vogel, *Pythagoras and early Pythagoreanism* (Assen 1966) 74.

40 B.A. van Groningen, *In the Grip of the Past, essay on an aspect of Greek thought* (Leiden 1953) *passim*.

41 Whether he was in Rome during the martyrdom of Polycarp, as is maintained in the "alternative ending" of the account of that martyrdom in a Moscow manuscript (see *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, ed. H. Musurillo [Oxford 1972] 20) may be a matter of dispute (cf. O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, I [Freiburg i.Br. 2¹⁹¹³] 400: "Könnte zutreffen, ist jedoch durchaus unverbürgt und schon ihrer legendenhaften Umgebung wegen verdächtig"). At any rate he visited Rome in 177/178 (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 5,4,1–2).

42 Irenaeus did not use the text of Deut. 19,15 or its echos in the New Testament, on which text see H. van Vliet, *No Single Testimony, A Study on the Adoption of the Law of Deut. 19:15 par. into the New Testament*, Thesis Utrecht 1958.

Irenaeus and the Pax Romana

Semper manet vinculum: I am delighted that these words, which the honoree and I, together with many others, have so often sung and said, are able to be reaffirmed and find form in this Festschrift contribution.

The bond between us was forged in the autumn of 1929 when I was allowed to carry the flag under which the freshman Hannes de Graaf made his entrance to Leiden's famous theologians' debating society "Quisque Suis Viribus". And as we converse now after almost half a century, our thoughts and conversations return automatically to those fine student days, not out of some inappropriate nostalgia but with deep gratitude for the intense theologising and the abundant cheerfulness, a mixture of which we enjoyed till deep in the night on the Rapenburg and in various fellow disputants' rooms. Our interest already developed then too, in different directions, but this did not bring any alienation but deepened the awareness of the range of theology and of the task of being occupied in this field linked to the other "each according to his strength". The "vinculum" has remained unforgettable, even though the course of our lives took Hannes and me on different paths and it surfaced again when one late evening in 1954 I went to visit him in Arnhem and we chatted until long after midnight about the wish of the Utrecht Faculty of Theology to see him in their midst as professor of ethics and encyclopedy. To our delight he responded to the call and so now for twenty more years we have been able to theologise together "quisque suis viribus", but conscious of the bond.

Fortunately the retrieval of these memories does not mean a retrospect on what once was, but an expression of gratitude for Hannes' friendship. What constantly strikes me and what constitutes the stimulating aspect of his friendship is the breadth of his interest and his deep respect for others; where he stands does not remain clouded in uncertainty, but he also has an eye for the interests and convictions of others; he is fully committed, but not tied to and by one way of thinking, because in deep mystical connection the Lord is a reality to him. And I therefore write this contribution with joy after 46 years above all under the banner of the "vinculum" that still remains. The honouree is the man of "Church and Peace", with a social conscience and irenic. An essay with the title "Irenaeus and the Pax Romana" therefore did not seem inappropriate in this celebration as a token of gratitude and friendship.

* Translated from the Dutch by David E. Orton.

From whom, and when, Irenaeus, bishop of Lyon in the last quarter of the second century, received his name, is not known. But in his case it would be inappropriate to respond sceptically, "What's in a name?" It must be said, he bore his name "the Peaceloving one" with honour.

This conclusion was already reached long ago by the church historian Eusebius, who writes in his *Hist.Eccl.* V 24 about a sharp controversy that had arisen around 190 between the Christian churches in Asia Minor and Rome over the paschal fasts. In this conflict Irenaeus also let his voice be heard by sending a letter to Rome in which he indicated a way out of the impasse caused by bishop Victor, with an implicit but unmistakable reproach to the Roman bishop. Eusebius quotes parts of the letter verbatim and concludes his report with this comment: "thus Irenaeus, who truly was well-named, became a peacemaker (*eirēnopoios*, the word from Matt 5:9!) in this matter, exhorting and negotiating in this way on behalf of the peace of the churches" (V 24.18). It is striking how centrally the word "peace" occurs in the fragments of the letter preserved by Eusebius, a peace that does not gloss over but respects, so that Irenaeus could put it paradoxically and sensitively: "the disagreement in regard to the fast confirms the agreement in the faith" (V 24.13). It might appear that the great, in many respects invaluable work of Irenaeus known to us as *Adversus Haereses* contradicts this characteristic, for is an anti-heresy campaigner not a fierce fighting cock, not to say a potential oppressor? But anyone who reads this writing closely is constantly and increasingly struck by the fairness of Irenaeus's account and the professionalism of his polemic, if on occasion the irenic slips into the ironic. In his work Irenaeus wanted to "follow only the true and steadfast Teacher, the Word of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, who did, through His transcendent love, become what we are, that He might bring us to be even what He is Himself" (*Adv.Haer.* V pref.).

Irenaeus lived in the period of Roman history that could be generally described with the title "la Paix romaine".¹ It is known how after the civil wars that plagued not only Italy, but almost the whole of the Mediterranean area in the first century BCE, the victory and the way of acting of Augustus were welcomed as the inauguration of a period of peace. The inscriptions from Asia Minor which give expression to the dominant emotions are famous: "providence, which directs our life, brought to this life the highest perfection by send-

1 P. Petit, *La Paix Romaine*, Paris 1967 (Nouvelle Clío 9); deals with the history of 31 BCE–193 CE). Although the dissertation of A.J.L. van Hoff bears the title "Pax Romana, een studie van het Romeinse imperialisme", diss. Nijmegen 1971, it is not significant for our subject, as this study deals more with the concept of "imperialism" and Roman history during the Republic c. 200 BCE.

ing us Augustus, whom it filled with virtue to be gracious to men, and through sending him as saviour for us and our descendants, him who would end the war and put everything into good order"; the birthday of this deity therefore became "the beginning of the good tidings for the world through him" (*ἔρξεν de tōi kosmōi tōn di auton euangeliōn hē genethlios tou theou*).²

This mood also remains as Augustus's rule is followed by that of other emperors and despite tensions present here and there and erupting from time to time, as with the Jews in the bloody conflict that led to the fall of Jerusalem.³ In the second century that feeling remained, as we shall see, unchanged and unbroken. The reigns of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius were times of quiet, prosperity and outward florescence. But Irenaeus lives under Marcus Aurelius, the philosopher on the imperial throne, who during his campaign against the Marcomanni wrote his famous and influential book of *Meditations* ("self-reflections") and under Commodus, during whose rule the disintegration of the coming century already announces itself.

What did Irenaeus, the peace-lover, who had such a heart for peace in the church, think of the "Pax Romana"? The nature of his writings that are preserved is such that the field of view does not extend much beyond the boundaries of the church. Irenaeus did not write an apology for the Christians, like so many which appeared in the time before Constantine. Nor did he find an opportunity to publish a set of guidelines for the Christian life, since his attention was absorbed by the dispute over the heart of the Christian faith: the questions of God and Jesus Christ. This dispute was forced upon him by the infiltration of Gnosticism into the church, and this produces, as is to be expected, a certain bias, or rather, certain sides of his life-world and his world of thought come strongly to the fore while others remain in the shadows.

However, an answer to the question is indeed to be found, although it is mentioned only in passing. But is it not often the case that casual remarks are illuminating? In *Adv. Haer.* IV 30.3 we read the brief but telling words: "through their (the Romans') instrumentality the world is at peace, so that we walk on the highways without fear, and sail where we will" (*Sed et mundum pacem habet per eos, ut nos sine timore in viis ambulemus et navigemus quocumque*

2 This famous inscription from 9 BCE is reproduced, among other places, in P. Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum. Die urchristlichen Literaturformen*, Tübingen 2³-1912, pp. 409f. and V. Ehrenberg & A.H.M. Jones, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*, Oxford 21955, pp. 81ff. Still significant, too, is the address by H. Wagenvoort, *Pax Augusta, gedachten over wereldvrede in het augusteische tijdvak*, Groningen 1930.

3 See H. Fuchs, *Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom in der antiken Welt*, Berlin 21964.

voluerimus). At first sight this statement is not much more than a commonplace. We read, for instance, in Epictetus, *Diss.* III 13.9: "Behold now, Caesar seems to provide us with profound peace,⁴ there are no wars any longer, nor battles, nor brigandage on a large scale, nor piracy, but at any hour we may travel by land, or sail from the rising of the sun to its setting".⁵ Well-known too is the statement by Plutarch in his *De Pythiae orac.* 28: in that part of his work he contrasts the earlier circumstances with those of the present: formerly people went to consult the oracle in Delphi concerning difficult matters of state, but now only about private affairs, because now the state—it pleases Plutarch to be able to say this—is stabilized: "for everywhere there is peace and quiet; an end has come to war; people are no longer hounded; there are no longer any civil wars or tyrants". In somewhat different words we read in *De tranquillitate animae*: "Nor should we overlook the general blessings . . . : that there is no internal or foreign war, that anyone who wants to do so can safely cultivate his land and sail the sea; that we may speak and be occupied practically but also keep silent and stay out of everything."⁶ Or one might read the "Roman Oration" of Aelius Aristides, an older contemporary of Irenaeus, with, among others, these words: "You, better than anyone else, have proved the truth of the proverb: The earth is everyone's mother and our common fatherland. It is now possible for Greek and barbarian, with or without property, to travel with ease wherever he wishes, as though passing from homeland to homeland. . . . As far as security is concerned, it suffices to be a Roman citizen, or rather one of those people united under their rule" (*Orat.* 26.100).⁷

We see here how everywhere the peace that the Roman Empire has brought and the possibility of safe traveling are praised as blessings for the time in which people live. We have deliberately cited a number of witnesses from the second

4 On this expression cf. my article, "Tiefer Friede (1 Klemens 2, 2)", *Vigiliae Christianae* 24 (1970), pp. 261ff.

5 English translation by W.A. Oldfather, in: *Epictetus. The Discourses as reported by Arrian, the Manual, and Fragments*, London 1926 (Tr.: Van Unnik quotes the Dutch translation by D.C. Hesselink, *De Kolleges van Epictetus*, Haarlem 1931, p. 245).

6 Following the Dutch translation by J.J. Hartman, *De Avondzon des Heidendoms*, Leiden 1924, p. 94; cf. Plutarch's brief work *De Fortuna Romanorum* (Dutch translation in Hartman, *op.cit.*, pp. 228ff.).

7 Cf. J.H. Oliver, *The Ruling Power: A Study of the Roman Empire in the Second Century after Christ through the Roman Oration of Aelius Aristides*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, n.s. 43.4, Philadelphia 1953. See also the historian Appian (mid-2nd cent.), *Historia Romana* I praef. 7: 200 years have passed since the appearance of the emperor "in which the city was specially embellished and its income grew to a very great height and everything developed in a long and stable period of peace to a situation of undisturbed bliss".

century here rather than from the days of Augustus, because in Irenaeus's day the latter already lay 200 years in the past. One should keep in mind, however, that though those whose words we read here belonged to the second century, they nonetheless lived in diverse times and circumstances. They are doing more than simply repeating a literary motif or a piece of state ideology. It was also a reflection of their own experience of life. A man like Irenaeus came from Asia Minor and had left for Gaul; he lived among the Celts and spoke mostly the language of the "barbarians" (*Adv.Haer.* praef. 3) and had made a return journey from Lyon to Rome at least once (see Eusebius *Hist.Eccl.* V 4.1–2). He was evidently able to make these trips safely without having to worry about bandits and pirates (cf. in contrast—to mention just one famous example—to Paul's words from 2 Cor 11:26!). This safety was due to the authority of the Romans. In this connection the comparison Irenaeus makes in *Adv.Haer.* II 6.2 is also interesting: "Shall not those who live under the empire of the Romans, although they have never seen the emperor, but are far separated from him both by land and sea, know very well, as they experience his rule, who it is that possesses the principal power in the state?"⁸ Just as everyone accepts that on earth, so too is it the case with the spiritual powers who are subject to the invocation of God's name. We can feel from these words how deeply permeated Irenaeus was by the omnipresent power of the invisible ruler over the Imperium Romanum and how sure he was that, before the emperor, all bowed.

Irenaeus gives the mention of the "Pax Romana" as if in passing in an odd context where it might not be expected. The chapter concerned (*Adv.Haer.* IV 30) presents the refutation of one of the many accusations brought by the followers of Marcion against the God of the Old Testament.⁹ This related to God's command to the Israelites in their exodus from Egypt to take all kinds of valuables with them.¹⁰ This question was of such importance to Irenaeus not

8 The text reads as follows: *At nunquid hi qui sub Romanorum imperio sunt, quamvis nunquam viderint Imperatorem, sed valde et per terram, et per mare separati ab eo, cognoscent propter dominium eum qui maximam potestatem habet principatus.*

9 This accusation by Marcion and his followers is found also in Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* II 20; IV 24; V 13; cf. A. von Harnack, *Marcion, das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*, Leipzig ²1924, p. 280 n. 4; the contrast was noticed between this commandment in Exodus and the task given by Jesus to his apostles in Matt 10:9f.

10 The text of Irenaeus, *Adv.Haer.* IV 30 reads: *Qui vero exprobant et imputant, quod profecturus populus, jussu Dei, vascula omnis generis et vestimenta acceperit ab Aegyptiis, et sic abierit; ex quibus et tabernaculum factum est in eremo, ignorantes justificationes Dei et dispositiones ejus, semetipsos arguunt, sicut et presbyter dicebat.*—On various translations and explanations of Exod 11:2 in Jewish sources see T.C. Vriezen, "Oude en jongere joodse commentaren op Ex. 3:21 v. en verwante verzen (11:2 f.; 12:35 v.)," in: *Vruchten van*

only because the doctrine of God is under dispute here but also because the exodus of Israel was a type of the conversion of Christians from heathendom.¹¹ This exodus motif was evidently accepted by his opponents, because Irenaeus bases his refutation on this fact and argues *ad hominem*: if this accusation is valid, then it is directed against the accusers themselves, to whom Jesus' words against the hypocrites apply, who do not see the beam in their own eye, though they see the splinter in someone else's (Matt 7:5). He then gives two reasons for this argument *a maiori*—our, the Christians', exodus from heathendom—*ad minus*—Israel's exodus from Egypt: a) We Christians have retained possession, received as inheritance from heathen relatives or gained during life as heathen; indeed as Christians we go on trading and making profit among the heathen;¹² the heathen owe us nothing and yet we profit from them, whereas the Egyptians had the Israelite Joseph to thank for their lives and so they were indeed in Israel's debt. b) The Egyptians had made the Jews work as slaves; the compensation at the exodus was therefore certainly appropriate, whereas the Romans and other heathen people owe us nothing, given that we now enjoy security thanks to them.¹³ So if we as Christians act like this and use

de Uithof (Festschrift for H.A. Brongers), Utrecht 1974, pp. 134ff.—The view of Irenaeus that the Israelites received it as their due pay for slavery (see the following text), is already found earlier in Jewish writings; cf. *Jub.* 48:18f., *Wis.* 10:17; Philo, *De Vita Mosi* I 141; cf. T.C. Vriezen, *loc.cit.*, pp. 135ff. See also D. Daube, *The Exodus Pattern in the Bible*, London 1963, pp. 56ff.

- 11 As regards this typological understanding Irenaeus is following a view commonly found among Christians. It would take us too far from the current topic to go into this further.
- 12 The text reads as follows: *Quis enim vendit, et non lucrari vult ab eo qui emit? Quis autem emit, et non vult utiliter secum agi ab eo qui vendit? Quis autem negotians non propterea negotiatur, ut inde alatur?* See Cadoux's work, so valuable for its precise source references: C.J. Cadoux, *The Early Church and the World*, Edinburgh 1925, p. 446 n. 6, with parallels.
- 13 See *Adv.Haer.* IV 30.2: *qui imputant populo pauca de multis laboribus accipienti sibi, et ipsis non imputant, qui nullam gratiam ex merito parentum debitam reddiderunt, immo et in gravissimam servitutem redigentes, maximam ab eis consecuti sunt utilitatem; et illos quidem non signatum aurum et argentum in pacis vasis de suis laboribus . . . accipientes injuste fecisse dicunt, semetipsos autem . . . ex alienis laboribus insigne aurum et argentum et aeramentum cum inscriptione et imagine Caesaris in zonis suis ferentes juste se facere dicunt . . . 30.3 utrumne populus ab Aegyptiis qui errant per omnia debitores; an nos a Romanis et reliquis gentibus et a quibus nihil tale nobis debeatur?* This is followed by the text about peace in the Roman Empire.

the money obtained from the “aliens”¹⁴ to build God’s tabernacle,¹⁵ then from the history of Exod 11 one cannot make any accusation against God.

Now the odd thing about this passage is that in it Irenaeus does not put his own thoughts into words but, as he clearly indicates, the views of one of his predecessors, an otherwise unnamed Presbyter.¹⁶ But he evidently takes responsibility for the latter too. To what extent the statement about the Roman Empire could have been added by Irenaeus is not easy to determine, but it does not seem likely. The fact that we can hear the master behind the bishop of Lyon makes this statement all the more interesting because here we do not, then, hear the judgment of a single person, but we perceive one that is shared by a number of people.

But a review of the context in which this saying is found draws our attention to other things. Cadoux brought together these words that formed our starting-point in his still valuable book, *The Early Church and the World*, under the main idea: “Christians recognized their *indebtedness to the Empire for the blessings of peace*.”¹⁷ That can indeed be read out of this text, but it is only one and certainly not the most important aspect of the matter for Irenaeus.

It is typical of Irenaeus and of the authority he is citing that at the end of this chapter attention is directed towards the future. And then expression is given to the firm conviction that those that experienced the “exodus” will be brought to the promised land. But we then read: “And if anyone will devote a closer attention to those things which are stated by the prophets with regard to the end, and those which John the disciple of the Lord saw in the Apocalypse, he will find that the nations receive the same plagues universally, as Egypt then did particularly.” So reference is here being made to Rev 15 and 16: prediction

14 In the subsequent text of *Adv.Haer.* IV 30.3, Irenaeus writes with reference to Matt 25:35f.: *et reliqua quaecunque beneficientes justificamur, velut de alienis nostra redimentes: de alienis autem ita dico, non quasi mundus alienus sit a Deo* (this would be the view of the Gnostics and Marcionites which Irenaeus rejects!), *sed quoniam hujusmodi dationes ab aliis accipientes habemus, similiter velut illi ab Aegyptiis.*

15 See above, n. 10. After the quotation given in n. 14 Irenaeus continues: *et per haec ipsa erigimus nobismetipsis tabernaculum Dei: cum bene enim facientibus habitat Deus.* Following a quotation of Luke 16:19 we then read: *quaecunque enim, cum essemus ethnici de injustitia acquisivimus, haec cum crediderimus in dominicas utilitates conversantes justificamur.*

16 See n. 10 and *Adv.Haer.* IV 31.1: *talía quaedam enarrans de antiquis presbyter reficiebat nos et dicebat.* In this context we do not need to go into the role of the presbyters in Irenaeus.

17 C.J. Cadoux, *op.cit.*, p. 386 (italics Cadoux’s), in a section dealing with the “Attitude to the State”, where texts are cited from other writers that witness to a friendly attitude towards Rome.

of judgment and demise. What Irenaeus says about the “Pax Romana” applies only for an interim period. Here we do not, then, hear of the eternal Rome as in the words of the eulogizers of Rome.¹⁸ No, they have come to an end, that glory and that peace.

In the second place we see in this passage that a clear distance is experienced. What one owns and uses as a Christian, one has from the “strange” world¹⁹ and now serves to put into practice the regulations of the gospel such as Matt 6:3; 25:35–36; Luke 3:11, “and precisely through these we erect the tabernacle of God in ourselves; for God lives with those who do good.”²⁰ The whole tenor of this passage is found in the statement: “For whatever we acquired from unrighteousness when we were heathen, we apply to the Lord’s advantage now that we have become believers and are counted as righteous” (*Adv. Haer.* IV 30.3). The saying about “peace” must be seen in that light also: this situation is a good opportunity to be busy in this interim as Christians “gone out from the strangers”. The “Pax Romana” is not a laudable goal in itself but a pleasant side-effect. It may well be the case that Irenaeus recognizes with gratitude the peace that Roman governance has brought and sets a tone that agrees to a striking degree with what heathen contemporaries were saying, but they resound in quite a different context. These are not the words of the church leader who feels at home and happy in the Imperium, but one who is conscious of living in the Interim.

This conclusion is given sharper focus if we read other instances in which Irenaeus regards his vision of the Roman Empire of his day.

In the first place one might think here of *Adv. Haer.* V 24, where Irenaeus brings up Paul’s words from Romans 13. It is a much-discussed passage²¹ precisely because one gains the impression that Irenaeus is here developing his

18 Cf. Virgil, *Aen.* I 278f.: *his (sc. Romanis) ego (sc. Zeus) nec metas rerum nec tempora pono: / imperium sine fine dedi*, and a host of other witnesses collected by G. Gernentz, “Laudes Romae”, diss. Rostock 1918, pp. 40–46, who refers to F.G. Moore, “Urbs aeterna and urbs sacra”, *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 25 (1894), pp. 34–60.

19 See n. 14.

20 This “bene facere” is, for Irenaeus and his contemporaries, rather different from “exercising charity” or “doing good works”; it might be phrased as just “perform the right actions towards others”; on this cf. H. Bolkestein, *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum*, Utrecht 1939, pp. 95ff., 470ff., and my article, “The Teaching of Good Works in I Peter”, *New Testament Studies* 1 (1954), pp. 92–110.

21 Cf. the important book by W. Affeldt, *Die weltliche Gewalt in der Paulus-Exegese, Rom. 13, 1–7 in den Römerbriefkommentaren der lateinischen Kirche bis zum Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts*, Göttingen 1969, pp. 36–43 and the bibliography given there, p. 37 n. 81.

view of, and attitude to, the state and the authorities. But this is only partly the case; it is more a “cultural view” than a doctrine of the state. He gives more general insights than a concrete discussion of his own situation. In this context it is not possible to give a detailed analysis and set about a comparative study (I hope to have the opportunity to do this in another context at a later date). But a few brief comments may not be out of place with an eye on our topic.

In the first place Irenaeus does not come to speak on this subject because he turns to the “Locus de Magistratu”, but because in his fight against Gnosticism he wants to show, with reference to the temptation of Jesus in the wilderness, which makes the great conflict in the world visible in a single event, that Satan is present in the end-phase of history as much as he is in the beginning. The last proof of this is given in the statement in Luke 4:6, the claim that Satan divides up power over the world (see V 24.1, 3). Against this, Irenaeus argues that the God whom the church confesses appoints kings, with an appeal to Prov 21:1; 8:15–16 and Rom 13:1, 4. The second text in particular is not devoid of importance because mentioned next to each other, in Irenaeus’s Bible, the Septuagint, are *basileis*, *dunastai*, *megistanes* and *turannoi*: a differentiation of rulers which is significant in the light of the following considerations.

It is then necessary to note that Irenaeus does not speak specially about the Roman state but about kings and governments in general. He was speaking especially, perhaps, of the imperial administration because this was the nearest to home, but certainly not exclusively or preeminently. He goes back to the origin of dominion and sees in this a curbing of the injustice that people inflict on each other out of hatred and greed. In Irenaeus’s view God gave fear of men (and power) when the fear of the Lord had disappeared because of apostasy. But this power is there specifically for the heathen and is subject to the ultimate judgment of God.²² It is noteworthy that Irenaeus does indeed know of differences between the rulers and assumes that the nation gets the governance that it deserves.²³ In what category the empire of his day belongs, he leaves unanswered. No discussion is given, either, to what attitude the Christian needs to assume, but implicitly this is indeed given with the fact that the authorities are typical of the heathen, who have to be kept from injustice,

22 Irenaeus, *Adv.Haer.* V 24.2: *Quoniam enim absistens a Deo homo in tantum efferavit, ut etiam consanguineum hostem sibi putaret... imposuit illis Deus humanum timorem, non enim cognoscebant timorem Dei, ut potestati hominum subjecti, et legum eorum abstricti, ad aliquid assequantur justitiae et moderentur ad invicem... iusto iudicio Dei ad omnes aequaliter perveniente, et in nullo deficiente.*

23 Irenaeus, *Adv.Haer.* V 24.3: *Cujus (sc. Dei) enim jussu homines nascuntur, hujus jussu et reges constituuntur, apti his qui illo tempore ab ipsis regnantur.*

whereas Christians know the Law of the Lord and honour Him. But they have to hold firm to the view that God has arranged things this way.

A third observation is that Irenaeus does not see the Roman Empire as an instrument of Satan either, or as the embodiment of the Antichrist (see below). No, Satan tries to achieve this by drawing people away from God, blinding their hearts and letting himself be worshipped as god. Here lies the conflict material for the Christian when he comes into contact with rulers that are on that path. But, Irenaeus concludes his discussion by saying, it is as a human being that the Word of God has defeated and unmasked him (see Luke 4) and given people power to overcome, according to the saying in Luke 10:19, "See, I have given you authority to tread on snakes and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy." Here, for Irenaeus, lies the heart of things, and the place where the Christian sees his position determined. The power of state *can* be an instrument of Satan if it leads to disobedience to God, just as, on the other hand, all sorts of rebelliousness can be used by him.²⁴

To the extent, then—if we may thus put into words Irenaeus's unexpressed conclusion—that state power promotes *justitia* between people, one can accept it, *rebus sic stantibus*. This latter condition is the crucial one, because Irenaeus follows Paul and this is his firm conviction: "For the figure of this world passes away" (*Adv.Haer.* IV 3.1; V 35.2). On the basis of the predictions of Daniel (cf. Paul [2 Thess 2:3–4]) and the Apocalypse Irenaeus expects the appearance of the Antichrist, to whom Satan has lent power and who will have himself worshipped in the temple of Jerusalem.²⁵ Daniel saw the end of the "last empire" (*Adv.Haer.* V 25.3) that will be divided between ten kings (Dan 7:20, 24; Rev 17:11) and Irenaeus adds the pregnant words: "among whom the empire which now rules shall be partitioned" (*Adv.Haer.* V 26.1). Jesus' saying about the kingdom that is divided against itself and cannot stand (Matt 12:25) also serves as an indication: "the kingdom must be divided and thus fall (*oportet dividi regnum et sic deperire*)". This is the last empire with feet partly of clay, partly of iron, and thus divided (Dan 2:41f.), with ten toes, that will be destroyed by the "stone not hewn with hands" (Dan 2:34), i.e. by Christ

24 Irenaeus, *Adv.Haer.* V 24.2: (*magistratus*) *quaecumque autem ad eversionem juste inique et impie et contra legem et more tyrannico exercuerint—, in his et peribunt; justo iudicio Dei ad omnes aequaliter perveniente . . . (regnum positum est) non a diabolo, qui nunquam omnino quietus est, imo qui ne ipsas quidem gentes vult in tranquillo agere.*

25 See the starting point for Irenaeus, *Adv.Haer.* V 25.1: *et per ea quae erunt sub Antichristo, ostenditur, quoniam (diabolus) existens apostata et latro quasi Deus vult adorari.*

(*Adv.Haer.* V 26.2).²⁶ Then the great tribulation will come upon the earth and apostasy and blasphemy of God will be complete and then in the middle of that “the church will suddenly be caught up” and “the last contest of the righteous will take place, in which, when they overcome they are crowned with incorruption” (*Adv.Haer.* V 29.1). This will happen soon, because the sixth millennium of the duration of the world is coming to an end; with Christ’s coming “the last days” have begun.²⁷ So this means that it will come to an end with the Roman Empire, and very soon. For our subject two further comments are in order at this point:

a) In *Adv.Haer.* V 30 Irenaeus gives a detailed discussion of the number of the Beast (Rev 13:18), because if one knows who is meant by this *isopsēphia*, one can recognize the Antichrist, whereas miscalculations lead one astray and cause one to go wrong at the decisive moment. There are all kinds of possible words that by letter values can add up to the sum of 666; one of these is *Lateinos*, “and this is very probable, this being the name of the last kingdom. For the Latins are they who at present bear rule” (*Adv.Haer.* V 30.3). But Irenaeus does not want to make too much of this, other solutions also being possible. The Holy Spirit did not want to make it known through John, who prophesied such a short time ago. It will be evident when the Antichrist takes possession of Jerusalem. Irenaeus thus considers it possible, though not certain, that the Roman ruler will be the revelation of the Antichrist. But he does not commit himself: it will become evident in due course. This is also an indication of what he thought of the Roman Empire.

b) In *Adv.Haer.* V 29.1 in summarizing his considerations in the preceding books Irenaeus states that the whole world order serves for the maintenance of humanity, because it prepares them for eternal obedience to God. “Those nations however, who did not of themselves raise up their eyes unto heaven, nor returned thanks to their Maker, nor wished to behold the light of truth, . . . are like a drop from a bucket, and as dust on the scales—in fact, as nothing (Isaiah 40:15), so far useful and serviceable to the just, as stubble conduces towards the growth of the wheat, and its straw, by means of combustion, serves for working gold.”

26 The Christological interpretation of the “stone” is not a special feature of Irenaeus but is found already in the New Testament, e.g. in Matt 21:42 par.; 1 Cor 10:4; 1 Pet 2:17 etc.; it belongs to the testimonia tradition; cf. J. Rendel Harris, *Testimonies*, Cambridge 1916, part I, pp. 26ff.

27 See my article, “Der Ausdruck ‘In den letzten Zeiten’ bei Irenaeus,” in: *Neotestamentica Patristica (Festschrift O. Cullmann)*, Leiden 1962, pp. 293–304; G. Jossa, *Regno di Dio e Chiesa*, Naples 1970, pp. 130–147.

Here too the language is general, but implicitly also a judgment is given about the Roman Empire. The Christians must live in that empire in peace and in conflict, because in it they are being prepared for fellowship with God, but this structure itself will fall. The power of the Imperium is no more than a drop in a bucket! The decisive thing is the attitude towards God, the Creator.

One more point needs to be addressed. Irenaeus wrote his work as bishop of Lyon, where not long before a violent persecution of Christians had taken place.²⁸ How does he view that martyrdom in his verdict on the Roman Empire? In as many words he does not go into or remind readers of the events that so shocked his own community and the memory of which of course was still lively. He is writing against Gnostics and Marcionites, not a history, or an apology or accusation. In the context of his argument it was therefore not called for to discuss this matter. But some statements clearly reveal his viewpoint. *Adv.Haer.* II 22.2, for instance, is doubtless a reflection on the situation. In view of the prophecy of Isa 61:2, “to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favour, and the day of vengeance of our God”,²⁹ which was seen fulfilled in the work of Jesus, the question is, where the day of vengeance is. There follows as a depiction of his own time: “for God makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the righteous and on the unrighteous” (Matt 5:45). But then, the righteous suffer persecutions, are mistreated and killed; the sinners, however, live in abundance, “inflamed by wine, whose feasts consist of lyre and harp, but who do not regard the deeds of the Lord” (Isa 5:12). For Irenaeus, however, this is no reason to doubt the truth of the prophecy. The day of reckoning will indeed come, but the word “year” should not be taken in a strictly chronological sense, but be taken as the time in which people are called and kept by the Lord. So the word “day” in Paul in Rom 8:36 is also meant as “this whole time in which we suffer persecution and are slaughtered like sheep” (this first person plural is in my view more than just a quotation of Paul’s words, but also expresses the writer’s own feeling, who knows that his life is in the balance!). Behind this passage there is a clear background of tension in the community which Irenaeus had to lead as pastor. Elsewhere, where he turns to deal with Docetists, he argues that Jesus would never have called His disciples to witness before princes and kings (Matt 10:18f.) with an outlook on martyrdom if He had not himself truly died on the cross (*Adv.Haer.* III 18.5). Here he

28 Known from the famous letter from the churches of Lyon and Vienna, preserved by Eusebius, *Hist.Eccl.* V 1.2–2.8; for the context in the life of Irenaeus see O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, Freiburg i.Br. 1913, vol. I, pp. 400f.

29 Cf. also Luke 4:19, but there without the last part.

echoes the words of Jesus which call to witness until death (Matt 16:24f.; 10:28, 32ff.) and then poses a question which is once again a reflection of tensions among Christians: "why have some of these men proceeded to such a degree of temerity, that they even pour contempt upon the martyrs, and vituperate those who are slain on account of the confession of the Lord, and who suffer all things predicted by the Lord, and who in this respect strive to follow the footprints of the Lord's passion (*secundum hoc conantur vestigia assequi passionis Domini*)?" Irenaeus does not express his own judgment on this, because those who have despised the martyrs will be put to shame by Christ himself. Towards the Gnostics, who are rarely prepared for martyrdom, Irenaeus remarks that the church alone "sustains with purity the reproach of those who suffer persecution for righteousness' sake, and endure all sorts of punishments, and are put to death because of the love which they bear to God, and their confession of His Son" (*Adv.Haer.* IV 33.9), just as, as Jesus said (Matt 5:12), the prophets suffered before them. In all respects Stephen followed the master of martyrdom and prayed for those who murdered him (Acts 7:60; *Adv.Haer.* III 12.13). These texts show that Irenaeus knows of the tensions that martyrdom brings but that this possible/necessary consequence of love for God and the confession of Christ belongs to this "in-between time" now that God's judgment is still to come. The persecution of Christians is not viewed as a consequence of a clash between the Imperium Romanum and the church. There is nothing to indicate this. Now this could be a consequence of the nature of Irenaeus's work as preserved, as mentioned above, but it is more appropriate in the context of his considerations to think of one, albeit bloody "incident" in which Satan succeeded in bringing those in power to this injustice and this wickedness. This is also the view that one finds in the "Letter of the churches of Lyon and Vienna" (Eusebius, *Hist.Eccl.* V 1.5, 16, 57 where "the wild Beast" incites the wild and barbaric tribes, the popular masses, against the believers). The persecution was an episode in the still current history, a foreshadowing of what would become universal if the now existing kingdoms should fall and the Antichrist should try to gain power.

The century in which Irenaeus lived was a time of prosperity and florescence. Anyone who visits the countries where his life was played out, when looking at the ruins that excavations have brought to light, is impressed by the significance of the "pax romana". The bishop of Lyon accepted this "for the time being", neither as a witness to the vitality of eternal Rome nor as a foreshadowing or sign of the coming Kingdom of God. In the light of Scripture he saw through it, measuring the rulers of his day against the question whether their

actions let justice flourish among people or indulged in injustice and ungodliness and he knew that even this imposing structure would soon go under. The powers of the Pax Romana must now in the time remaining to them serve to build God's dwelling-place among humanity, as those who believe in the eternal God, the Creator and Father of Jesus Christ, "do good" in accordance with His will.

Index of Modern Authors

- Abel, E. 210
Affeldt, W. 370
Aland, K. 32, 36
Alban Wells, L.S. 161
Alberti, J. 21
Allen, T.W. 227
Almquist, H. 64
Altaner, B. 174, 175, 204, 243, 249, 301
Amann, J. 206
Amstutz, J. 46
Andresen, C. 170
Arnim, J. ab 49
Avenarius, G. 83, 91, 92, 97, 347
- Babut, D. 179
Badt, G. 141
Bakhuizen van den Brink, J.N. 323
Baljon, J.M.S. 53
Barber, G.L. 96
Bardenhewer, O. 174, 222, 362, 374
Barrett, C.K. 46, 51
Bauernfeind, O. 46
Baus, K. 230
Beek, M.A. 137, 138
Behm, J. 113
Bensch, A. 314, 315
Benoit, A. 318
Benoit, P. 4
Bergh van Eysinga, G.A. van den 247, 250
Bertram, G. 20f., 133
Bethge, E. 239, 240
Betz, O. 99, 134
Beyschlag, K. 241, 249, 253
Bikerman, E. 25
Billerbeck, P. 11, 15, 106, 143, 159, 223, 226, 328
Billius 319
Blum, G.G. 337, 343
Bogaert, P. 342
Bolkestein, H. 55, 131, 170, 370
Boll, F. 226, 227, 338
Bonhöffer, A. 53
Bonnard, P. 8
Botte, B. 359
Born, A. van den 161
- Boumann, C.A. 255
Bousset, W. 70
Braudy, B.J. 355, 356
Braun, M. 79
Braun, H. 162
Bruce, A.B. 19
Büchsel, F. 86
Brühne, B. 77
Bultmann, R. 65, 70
Buresch, K. 194, 195, 196
Burkert, W. 198, 201
Buttrick, G.A. 5
- Cadoux, C.J. 368, 369
Casel, O. 86, 187, 195, 331
Cauwelaert, R. van 249
Chadwick, H. 306, 357, 358
Charles, R.H. 10, 46, 162, 166, 167, 168, 170, 174, 176, 180, 185, 320, 342
Childs, B.S. 69
Christ, W. von 196
Conzelmann, H. 54, 131, 135, 264
Cranfield, C.B. 19
Cullmann, O. 59
Cumont, F. 202
- Dahl, N.A. 230, 336
Dalglish, E.R. 9
Dalman, G.H. 143
Daniélou, J. 170, 355, 358
Daube, D. 368
Deissmann, A. 252
Delatte, L. 257
Delling, G. 31, 122, 134, 162, 165, 183, 212, 220, 221, 226, 264
Denis, A.M. 348
Dibelius, M. 47, 55, 133, 140
Diels, H. 180, 192, 197, 198, 200, 203, 204, 216, 217
Dihle, A. 221
Dittenberger, G. 202
Dörrie, H. 197, 352
Doutrelau, L. 321f.
Drower, E.S. 167

- Ehrenberg, V. 365
 Eliade, M. 211

 Feldman, L.H. 73, 88f.
 Festugière, A.J. 178, 188, 189, 193, 207
 Ficker, G. 337
 Filson, F.V. 5
 Fischer, J.A. 243, 250, 253, 255, 256, 260, 261, 262
 Fitzmyer, J.A. 44
 Foerster, W. 132, 208, 217, 260
 Fuchs, H. 158, 256, 365
 Funk, F.X. 215
 Furley, D.J. 177

 Gärtner, H. 59
 Garvie, A.E. 44
 Gebhard, O. von 240
 Geffcken, J. 62
 Gernentz, G. 370
 Geyl, P. 3
 Ginzberg, L. 139, 143
 Gnilka, C. 338
 Goodspeed, E.J. 322
 Gould, E.P. 19, 20
 Grabe, J.E. 200, 353
 Graham, H.H. 242, 328
 Grant, R.M. 215, 242, 258, 262, 323, 328, 333
 Gressmann, H. 177
 Grinfeld, E.W. 60
 Groningen, B.A. van 64, 220, 226f., 362
 Grundmann, W. 130
 Gruppe, O. 184
 Guthrie, W.K.C. 184

 Hadas, M. 37
 Haenchen, E. 208
 Hagen, H. 198
 Hahn, A. 320
 Hahn, G.L. 320
 Harder, R. 197
 Harl, M. 214
 Harnack, A. von 116, 125, 232, 239–241, 249, 250, 253, 320, 333, 337, 367
 Harris, J.R. 52, 105, 328, 373
 Hartmann, J.J. 366
 Harvey, W.W. 200, 312, 313, 317, 319, 322, 340, 353, 360

 Hatch, E. 38
 Headlam, A.C. 44, 46
 Heinemann, I. 147
 Hengel, M. 27
 Hennecke, E. 337
 Herrmann, J. 260
 Hesselung, D.C. 366
 Hoff, A.J.L. van 364
 Höfler, A. 206
 Hoh, J. 342
 Holl, K. 111, 317
 Holliday, W.R. 227
 Homeyer, H. 97
 Hornschuh, M. 328
 Horst, P.W. van der 227
 Houssiau, A. 314

 James, M.R. 328
 Jeremias, J. 11, 32, 105, 234
 Jones, A.H.M. 365
 Jossa, G. 324, 373

 Käsemann, E. 57f., 242
 Kattenbusch, F. 315f., 333
 Keller, C.A. 13
 Kelly, J.N.D. 310
 Kemmer, E. 221
 Kern, O. 174, 178, 183, 185, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 300
 Kiechle, F. 96
 Kingdon, H.P. 87, 88, 89
 Kittel, G. 31, 46, 105, 134, 161, 162, 166, 168, 185, 346
 Klebba, E. 312
 Kleinknecht, H. 210
 Klostermann, E. 8, 204
 Knopf, R. 116, 125, 133, 245, 246, 247, 250, 255, 257, 258, 262
 Knox, J. 44
 Koep, L. 233
 Koops, M.A. 212
 Kraft, H. 225
 Kranz, W. 197, 198, 200, 216, 217
 Krause, M. 207, 208, 217
 Krenkel, M. 116
 Kroll, J. 135
 Kuhn, K.G. 139, 149, 154
 Kuyper, D. 100

- Labib, P. 207
 Lagrange, M.J. 4, 5, 44, 51, 191, 193
 Lampe, G.W.H. 318, 319
 Lawlor, H.J. 345
 Lebram, J.C.H. 38
 Leder, H.G. 253
 Leeuw, G. van der 132
 Liang, K.J. 173
 Liebermann, S. 223
 Lietzmann, H. 45, 54, 187, 210, 229
 Lightfoot, J.B. 232, 241, 242, 306–308, 337
 Lilla, S.R.C. 231
 Lindner, H. 82, 99
 Lobeck, C.A. 183, 193, 195, 199, 200
 Loenen, D. 148
 Lohmeyer, E. 8, 10, 38, 161, 162, 167, 168, 170, 174, 176, 180, 182, 185, 186, 225, 227
 Lohse, E. 161, 164
 Lumpe, A. 134
 Luther, M. 45, 72

 Maanen, W.C. van 43
 Malherbe, A.J. 47
 Manson, T.W. 320
 Marcus, R. 139
 Marrou, H.I. 230
 Massuet, R. 353
 Mayer, R. 165
 Mayer-Maly, T. 144
 Mayor, J.B. 46
 McNeile, A.H. 8
 Merlan, P. 179
 Meyer, R. 103, 105, 106
 Michaelis, W. 228, 229, 347
 Michel, O. 6, 64, 210, 264, 330
 Miller, E. 210
 Mingana, A. 52
 Miranda, J.P. 32
 Mondésert, C. 171
 Montefiore, H. 115
 Moore, F.G. 370
 Morin, J.A. 139
 Mountford, J.F. 198
 Mras, K. 194, 356
 Mühl, M. 146
 Müller, J.G. 166
 Mussies, G. 61
 Musurillo, H. 362

 Nida, E.A. 42, 56
 Nilsson, M.P. 185
 Nock, A.D. 202
 Norden, E. 187, 190, 210, 211, 222, 229

 Oepke, A. 261
 Oldfather, W.A. 366
 Oliver, J.H. 366
 Oosterzee, J.J. van 74
 Orton, D.E. 17, 28, 158, 363
 Oulton, J.E.L. 345

 Passow, F. 20
 Pease, A.S. 102, 103, 151
 Pelletier, A. 79, 89, 90
 Peterson, E. 308
 Petit, P. 364
 Places, E. des 170, 351, 352, 355
 Ploeg, J.P.M. van der 184
 Pohlenz, M. 9
 Preisendanz, K. 207, 209, 210, 211
 Preiser, H. 331
 Preuschen, E. 333, 337
 Procksch, O. 149
 Puchinger, G. 28

 Quandt, G. 209
 Quasten, J. 175

 Raby, F.J.E. 198
 Rambaut, W.H. 338
 Raphelius, G. 21, 59
 Rappaport, S. 141
 Redpath, H.A. 38
 Reiling, J. 102, 308
 Reinach, T. 102, 146, 166, 186, 190, 223
 Reitzenstein, R. 226
 Rengstorff, K.H. 73, 152, 346f.
 Ridderbos, H. 54f.
 Rigaux, B. 47, 55
 Rissi, M. 161
 Roberts, A. 312f., 315, 319, 322, 338, 354, 355
 Robinson, J.M. 70
 Ropes, J.H. 46
 Ross, W.D. 197, 198, 204
 Rostovzeff, M. 256
 Rousseau, A. 321f., 340–342
 Rudolph, K. 217

- Sagnard, F. 200, 361
 Sanday, W. 44, 46
 Sanders, J.A. 184
 Sanders, L. 262
 Saunier, M.J. 352
 Scheller, P. 58, 83, 141
 Schlatter, A. 5, 9, 19, 24, 77, 108, 113, 130, 132,
 135, 149, 165, 166, 224
 Schlier, H. 152
 Schmid, H.R. 13
 Schmid, W. 196
 Schmidt, H.W. 44
 Schmidt, J.H.H. 220, 226
 Schmidtke, F. 257
 Schnackenburg, R. 29, 31, 160
 Schneemelcher, W. 239
 Schniewind, J. 8, 16, 72
 Schreckenber, H. 73, 74, 75, 77
 Schrenk, G. 255
 Schroeder, L. von 167
 Schubert, P. 130, 136
 Schürer, E. 74, 146, 164
 Schweizer, E. 160
 Selwyn, E.G. 264, 331
 Sikes, E.E. 227
 Shutt, R.J.H. 105
 Smith, J.P. 327, 328, 344
 Sobosan, J.G. 337
 Speyer, W. 91, 97
 Spödowsky, H. 79
 Staab, K. 44
 Stählin, G. 27
 Stählin, O. 173, 174, 194, 196
 Stein, E. 119, 126
 Stephanus, H. 20, 21
 Stieren, A. 200, 317, 319, 353
 Stieren, W. 308
 Strack, H.L. 11, 15, 106, 143, 159, 328
 Strecker, G. 248
 Strobel, A. 57, 58
 Strycker, É. de 13
 Stuhlmacher, P. 69, 70
 Stuißer, A. 174, 175, 204, 243
 Swete, H.B. 20, 162
 Taber, C.R. 42
 Tarn, W.W. 257
 Taylor, V. 159
 Terwogt, W.A. 87
 Thackeray, H.S.J. 78, 104, 105, 119, 139, 141,
 142, 145, 147, 148, 152, 166
 Thesleff, H. 198, 201
 Thierry, J.J. 259
 Thilo, G. 198
 Tischendorf, C. 53
 Toynbee, A.J. 83
 Trimpf, W. 316
 Turner, C.H. 107
 Veldhuizen, A. van 19, 20
 Vissering, G. 43
 Vliet, H. van 112, 296, 362
 Vogel, C.J. de 362
 Vögtle, A. 261
 Völker, W. 173
 Vona, C. 217
 Vriezen, T.C. 367f.
 Wagenvoort, H. 365
 Wahl, C.A. 20
 Walter, N. 194f.
 Waszink, J.H. 171, 338, 354, 357, 358
 Weiss, B. 44, 51
 Wenschkewitz, H. 130
 Wesley, C. 210, 211
 Wibbing, S. 261
 Windisch, H. 52, 57, 122, 133, 231, 331, 341
 Wingren, G. 323
 Weber, W. 105
 Weinreich, O. 183, 185, 197, 202, 204, 206,
 209, 210, 220, 222
 Wendland, P. 89, 353, 365
 Wettstein, J.J. 21, 26, 64, 162, 187
 Wolfson, H.A. 154, 189
 Wrede, W. 4, 8, 248
 Zahn, T. 44, 306, 337, 347
 Zahn-Harnack, A. von 239
 Zeller, E. 184, 193, 201
 Ziegler, K. 205
 Zscharnack, L. 183

Index of Ancient Literature

Abbreviations according to *SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (ed. P.H. Alexander et al.; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999).

1. Bible (Selection)	7:4	147	21:16	11
	13:1	90	22:15ff.	109
A. Old Testament	18:21	113	24:2ff.	11
Gen	18:22	104		
1:26	186	19:15	112, 362	2 Chr
2:1ff.	215	21:23	15	13:4–12
4:11	13	25:13–15	171	13:11
6:2	319	27:25	12, 14f.	13:12
6:10ff.	257	32:15	150,	30:1ff.
9:6	11		265	34:23ff.
21:33	212			
31:44ff.	297	Josh	Esth	
		22:27f.	3:8	146
Exod			8:12b	22
3:2	233	1 Sam		
3:6	174, 233	8:5ff.	155	Job
11:2	368	11:6 (LXX)	102	4:1
13:1f.	214	19:5	12	5:17–26
16:18	312	20:23ff.	297	31:17 (LXX)
20:4	164	25:26	12	45
33:2	321	25:31	12	Pss
34:16	147			15:5 (LXX 14:5)
		2 Sam		18:26ff.
Lev		10:4	133	32:1ff.
17:11	11	15:1	8	34:15b
		16:15ff.	8	50:16ff.
Num		16:23	8	50:16–23
24:17	103	17:14	8	88:4f.
25:1ff.	137–157	17:15ff.	8	103:19
25:1–5	138f.	17:23	8–10	106:38–41
25:4	147	20:11 (LXX)	24	(LXX 105:38–41)
25:6–13	138f.	21:1ff.	15	106:38
25:6 (LXX)	149			(LXX 105:38)
25:14f.	138f.	1 Kgs		13:11f.
25:16	138	5:10–13	129	139:7–10
25:31ff.	148	5:14–21	129	
31:16	141	8:22–53	129	Prov
31:29	214	8:23f.	136	1:23–33
		11:2	147	3:34
Deut		15:30	163	8:15–16
4:2	90			8:22
6:4	159,	2 Kgs		11:26
	176	10:29	163	21:1
7:3	147	10:31	163	22:8f. (LXX)

<i>Isa</i>		5:12	375	19:28	34
5:12	374	5:45	374	21:6	342
6:9f.	36	6:3	370	23:29	342
11:6ff.	344	7:5	368		
40:12	196	9:15	342	<i>John</i>	
40:15	373	10:9f.	367	1:1	234
41:4 (LXX)	176	10:18f.	374	1:3	232
44:6	223, 226	10:24	311	1:14	323
44:24	196	10:28	375	1:17	33
54:1b	327	10:32ff.	375	1:18	321
55:11	196	11:29	181	5:12	31
60:1f.	196	12:25	372	6:59f.	33
61:2	374	13:52	72	7:7	31
66:1	196	16:22	27	7:9	29, 31
		16:23	17-27	8:56f.	339
<i>Jer</i>		16:24f.	375	9:5	31
2:33f.	11	21:4	7, 15	9:6	29, 31
26:15 (LXX 33:15)	11	21:29	6	11:11	33
32:6	10	21:30	6	11:28	30, 31
41:3	113	21:32	6, 7	11:28a	31
		21:42	373	11:43	32
<i>Ezek</i>		25:35f.	370	12:6	7
12:13	113	26:14-16	7	12:39	351
		26:65f.	10	13:21	32
<i>Dan</i>		26:75	16	16:4	34
2:34	372	27:3-10	3, 4	18:1	30, 32
2:36	101	27:3-5	4-16	18:22	32
2:40	85	27:4	13	18:38	33
2:41f.	372	27:5	9, 10, 16	19:37	351
2:44	104	27:24	15	20:14	33
2:45	101	27:25	11	20:18	34
5:5ff.	80f.	27:29	230	20:20	33
7:13f.	103f.			20:22	33
7:20	372	<i>Mark</i>		20:31	32
7:24	372	2:20	342	21:9	28
		8:33	17-27	21:19	33
<i>Hos</i>		<i>Luke</i>		<i>Acts</i>	
2:25	327	1:2	345	1:9	34
9:10	143	3:11	45, 370	2:17	264
<i>Joel</i>		4:6	371	7:60	375
3:1	264	4:19	374	17:25	125
		5:25	342	18:24	311
<i>Zech</i>		6:40	311	19:40	34, 40
11:12f.	10	7:22	342	19:41	36
		8:8	36	20:36-38	35
<i>B. New Testament</i>		10:19	372	26:4f.	296
<i>Matt</i>		14:11	172	26:30	35
3:3	315	16:19	369	27:34	35
5:9	364	18:14	172	28:29	35

<i>Rom</i>		<i>Eph</i>		3:10-12	264
1:11	47	2:7	320	3:18	323
1:20	187	2:12	325	5:5	260
1:29-32	261	2:19-21	234	5:6	181
1:32	302	2:19	325		
7:12	154	2:20	232, 234	<i>1 John</i>	
8:5	22	3:6	325	1:1-3	345
8:36	374	3:18	326		
9:25	327	4:6	326	<i>Rev</i>	
9:32	322f.	4:14	52	1:8	160, 166, 168,
10:10	262	4:18	45		228
11:33	314, 330			1:12	161
11:36	210, 229	<i>Phil</i>		1:16	161
12:3	53	2:6-8	181	1:17f.	161
12:4-8	54f.	4:3	359	1:18	161
12:6	47, 53f.			2:1	161
12:7f.	51	<i>Col</i>		2:8	161
12:8	42-56	1:15	321	2:14	141, 159
13:1-7	57	1:16	320	2:20	159
13:1	371	1:18	325	3:14	228, 325
13:3-4	57-65			4:8	161
13:4	371	<i>1 Thess</i>		4:11	186, 228
15:10-12	351	2:2	51	11:17	161
		2:3-4	372	13:18	342, 373
<i>1 Cor</i>		2:8f.	47, 51	16:5	161
3:1f.	230			17:11	372
8:1	53, 313	<i>1 Tim</i>		17:18	158
8:6	210	1:17	321	19:6	158
10:4	373	2:4	311	21:5f.	163
12:8	51	6:16	321	21:6	160f., 166,
12:11	54	6:20ff.	50		185, 225
15:28	234, 235			21:7	228
15:45	234	<i>2 Tim</i>		21:8	228
15:53	326	2:1ff.	50	22:6	158
16:10-11	269	4:21	359	22:13	160f., 166, 167,
					225, 231, 235
<i>2 Cor</i>		<i>Heb</i>		22:14	228
1:12	52	1:5	351	22:15	228
4:2	52	8:8	342	22:18	228
7:8-10	6				
7:10	8	<i>Jas</i>			
8:2	46	4:6	260	2. Jewish Writings	
9:11	46				
9:13	46	<i>1 Pet</i>		<i>A. Apocrypha</i>	
11:3	46	1:10	331	<i>Ep Jer 27</i>	45
11:26	367	2:10	327		
		2:13ff.	58	<i>1 Macc</i>	
<i>Gal</i>		2:14	64	1:37	11
3:10ff.	14, 16	2:17	373	4:46	107
4:27	327	2:21	323	7:5	25

<i>1 Macc (cont.)</i>		<i>T. Levi</i>		130f.	135
8:30	94	5,4	233	<i>Prob.</i> 2,13	357
9:27	107	16,3	10	<i>Sacr.</i> 131	60
10:20	22	<i>T. Zeb.</i>		<i>Somn.</i>	
14:41	107	2,2	10	1,29	134
		6,4	45	1,134	134
<i>2 Macc</i>				2,193	171
1:35	48	<i>C. Rabbinical Writings</i>		<i>Spec.</i>	
3:34	36f.	<i>Gen. Rab.</i> 81(52a)	223	1,54-58	140
8:12	48			1,56	142
		<i>m. Sanh.</i> X1	154	1,204	10
<i>4 Macc</i>				3,29	147, 214
6:30	37	<i>Shemoneh Esre</i>	268	4,77	60
9:10	37			<i>Virt.</i>	
9:19	37	<i>y. Sanh.</i> 18a	166	9	189
9:25	37			34ff.	150
11:17	37	<i>y. Sanh.</i> 27c	154	182	154
				227	60
<i>Tob</i>		<i>D. Non-Rabbinical Writings</i>			
3:10	8	a. Philo		b. Josephus	
7:10	48	<i>Cher.</i> 46	189	<i>A.J.</i>	
		<i>Conf.</i> 6	257	1,5	85
<i>Wis</i>		<i>Her.</i>		1,7	85
3:1ff.	124	120-122	214	1,9-11	79f.
6:24	256	121	214f.	1,11	85
7:13	48	122	215	1,14	84, 141
10:7	258	187	214	1,17	86f., 87,
10:17	368	189	214		90
		<i>Legat.</i> 349	348	1,18	151
<i>B. Pseudepigrapha</i>		<i>Mos.</i>		1,19	84
<i>Apoc. Bar.</i> 29,5	342	1,65	230	1,23	84
		1,141	368	1,41	134
<i>1 En.</i>		1,153f.	60	1,50	134
6,1ff.	319f.	1,292-294	142	1,58	13, 14
93,2	233	1,294-304	140	1,100-103	38
		1,294-299	140	1,103	38
<i>Jub.</i> 48,18f.	368	1,295	142	1,231	224
		1,298	142, 146	1,238	155
<i>L.A.B.</i> 18,13	140, 142	1,300-301	140	1,339	155
		1,300	144	2,89	101
<i>Let. Aris.</i>		1,301b-304	140	2,161-165	38
43	79	<i>Opif.</i> 156	52	2,166	38
311	89	<i>Plant.</i>		2,285	38
315	86	73	212	2,287	38
		76	213	3,84-88	39
<i>Odes Sol.</i> 7,3	52	77	213	3,89	39
		78-92	213f.	3,141	150
<i>T. 12 Patr.</i>		93	212f.	3,145-147	150f.
<i>T. Dan</i> 6,9	48	94	214	3,148f.	150
<i>T. Iss.</i> 7,5	45	126	135	3,150	151

3,223	150	7,286	24	10,239	81
4,11ff.	116, 148	7,296f.	15	10,241	80
4,12	148	8,106-110	129	10,249	50
4,20	106	8,107	130	10,268	103, 109
4,52	155	8,108	134	10,276ff.	111
4,102ff.	103	8,111-117	39	11,15	85
4,126ff.	138	8,111-113	129f.	11,68	119
4,128	141	8,111	125, 134	11,106	110
4,130	138, 148	8,112	134	11,140-153	144
4,135	146	8,114-118	129	11,155	104
4,137	146	8,118	39	11,212	146
4,139	156	8,122	132, 133	11,273	22
4,141	150	8,175	49	11,333-335	39
4,142	153	8,190-192	147	11,336	39
4,144	149	8,227f.	39	12	89
4,145-149	39	8,229	39	12,109	90
4,145-147	150	8,277-281	162	12,112	86
4,145	151	8,279	163	12,392	24
4,146	151, 153f.	8,280	162, 164,	12,399	25
4,147	151, 153		165, 168,	12,418	94
4,148f.	150		206, 224	13,5	107
4,148	153	8,281	162f., 164	13,28	25
4,150f.	155	8,300	132	13,377	25
4,150	39, 151	8,418ff.	113	14,90	25
4,151	139	9,59	49	14,268	25
4,180-193	39	9,205ff.	110	14,371	190
4,194	39	9,214	110	14,450	25
4,196f.	93	9,228	9	15,172	25
4,303	104	9,239ff.	110	15,205	163
4,318	165	9,242	110	18,77	39
4,320	106	9,248ff.	108	18,78	39
4,329	106	9,261f.	39	18,186	39
5,30	131	9,263	39	18,279-283	39
5,33	125	9,265ff.	108	18,284	39
5,112f.	297	10	156	18,337	39
5,236-239	39	10,35	109	18,338	39
5,239	39	10,38f.	108	19,184	131
6,56	102	10,39	133	19,225	131
6,76	102	10,60f.	110	20,18	163
6,88-91	39	10,79f.	112	20,100	156
6,92	39	10,79	111	20,123	39
6,267	61	10,88f.	112	20,262	86
6,286	133	10,92	110	23,28	25
6,303	12	10,98	111		
7,28	25	10,104ff.	111	<i>B.J.</i>	
7,119	133	10,106f.	113	1,3	83
7,202	24	10,141	113	1,7f.	94
7,204	24	10,142	113	1,22	94
7,228f.	9	10,210	85, 104	1,26	94
7,266	152	10,218	85, 87, 92	1,464	25

<i>B.J. (cont.)</i>		2,121	146	<i>1 Clem.</i>	
2,137f.	124	2,164f.	186	1,1	242, 244,
3,351f.	101	2,165	187		284, 296
3,353	102, 103	2,166–169	186f.	1,2–2,8	288
3,354	99	2,167	186, 188	1,2–2,1	265
3,357ff.	99	2,168	190	2,2	264, 269
3,361ff.	9	2,169	189, 190	2,4	286, 302
3,387ff.	100	2,170f.	224	2,5f.	265
3,392ff.	102	2,173ff.	152f.	2,5	263
3,400	102	2,173	153	3,1	150
3,404	102	2,181	224	3,2–4	266
3,405	102	2,190	163, 165,	4–38	246
3,406f.	102		182f., 188,	4,1f.	266
3,408	103		201, 224	4,8	255
3,440	163	2,258	146	4,12	116
4,592ff.	103	4,190	186	5,1	242, 290
4,623	103	4,191f.	186	5,3	360
4,625	103			5,7	290
4,626	103	<i>Vita</i>		6,1	290
4,629	103	1ff.	83	6,2	290
5,19	225	20	25	6,4	290
5,362ff.	104			7,1	284, 285,
5,556	152	c. Qumran			302
6,9	163	1QS 6,13–23	124	9,1	257f., 259,
6,134	60f.				286, 300
6,312f.	103			9,4	257
6,403	163	3. Christian Writings		11	258
7,50	146, 156			13,1f.	285
7,157	163	<i>Ap. John</i>	207, 208, 222	13,3	300
				14,1f.	286
<i>C. Ap.</i>		<i>Aristides, Apologia</i>		14,1	300
1,8	81f., 87	1,4	217	15,1	260, 266,
1,14	190	4,1	188		269
1,33	119	13,7	61	16,5	264
1,37ff.	94f.			16,7	290
1,37	94, 106, 118,	<i>Athenagoras, Leg.</i>		19,2–21,3	287
	152	4,1	188	19,2	267
1,40	106	10,1	321	19,3	267
1,41	106f.	22,5	188	20	256, 267
1,42f.	127	24	62	20,1	259
1,50	119	30,2	50	20,3	259
1,54	83			20,4	259
1,143f.	82	<i>Augustinus, Civ.</i>	7,30 207	20,9	50, 259
1,154	82			20,10f.	256
1,162	190	<i>Barn.</i>		20,10	257, 259
1,165	190	1,5	50, 52	20,11	259, 286
1,201–204	102	6,5	52	21,1	259
2,14	190	6,13	231	21,5	296
2,79	146	12,2f.	341	22	264
2,102	133	17,1	52	22,5	264, 267

23-27	258	56,16	269, 286	3,3,22,1	172
23,1	286	57,1f.	277	<i>Protr.</i>	
28,1	286	57,3-7	276	1,3,1	174
30	260	58,1	276, 277, 285,	2,21,2	174
30,1-3	260		301	6,69	167
30,1f.	262	58,2	252, 276, 277,	6,69,4	171
30,1	261, 285		294	6,70,1	171
30,3	261, 266, 285	59,1	249, 284,	6,71,3	175
30,8	260		285f., 301	7,74,3-6	174
31,2	255	59,2-61,3	255	<i>Quis div.</i>	
33,8	290	59,2	302	10,1	152
34,1ff.	262	59,3ff.	267	14,4	152
34,7	262	60,3	268	<i>Strom.</i>	
35,1f.	287	60,4	255, 275, 304	1,15,66,3	171
35,5	260, 261, 285	61,1	255, 268,	2,22,132,1	172
35,6	302		270, 275, 286	4,25,156,2ff.	231
38,1f.	284	61,2	270	5,14,95,4	172, 176
40,1	284	62,1f.	246, 252	5,14,108,5	175
41,4	286	62,2	263, 268, 285	5,14,124,1f.	196
43	117	62,3	284	5,14,124,1	194
44ff.	250, 289	63,1	290	6,5,39,2f.	204
44	247	63,1f.	287	6,5,39,5	205
44,3ff.	296	63,2ff.	250	6,7,58,1	205
44,3	242	63,2-4	244	6,16,141,7	232
44,6	244	63,2	252-255,	7,10,55,5f.	231
45,2	284		274, 275, 284,	7,16,100,3	173
46,1-4	260		294, 295, 301,		
46,1	290		302, 303, 304	<i>Diogn.</i> 7,2	321
46,2ff.	302	63,3	253f., 295,		
46,6	278		297	Epiphanius, <i>Pan.</i>	
46,7	285, 296	63,4	269, 298	27,6,2	360
47,1ff.	242	64,1	268	31,31,5-12	308
47,6	244, 302	65,1	244,		
47,7	245, 258,		254-256,	<i>Ep. Apos.</i>	
	286, 293f.		269, 275,	5(16)	278
48,1	254, 300, 303		295, 296, 298	33	328
48,6	287				
49	262	2 <i>Clem.</i>		Eusebius	
49,2	262	2,1-3	328	<i>Praep. ev.</i>	
50,1	287	19,1	303, 304	6,6,16	62
50,2	263, 286	20,5	321	6,6,18	62
50,5	263			11,13	176
51,2	257	<i>Ps.-Clem.</i>		11,13,5	176
53,1	284, 299	1,9,3	348	11,13,6-8	176
54	277	1,11,4	52	11,13,8	177
54,2	269, 301, 305			13,12,4	196
55,1	290	Clemens Alexandrinus		13,12,33ff.	194
56,1	286, 301, 304	<i>Exc.</i> 78,2	315	13,13,16f.	176
56,2	284	<i>Paed.</i>		15,5,2	176, 180,
56,6	284	1,6,36,1	230		356
56,12f.	269	2,8,75,2	230	15,6,3	355

<i>Hist. eccl.</i>		2,15	295	1,22,1	310, 320
3,9,2	74	6,1	324	2, <i>praef.</i>	308, 309
3,15	360	<i>Smyrn.</i> 2,1	323	2,2f.	326
3,39,2	343	<i>Trall.</i>		2,6,2	367
3,39,13	343	1,1f.	295	2,10,1	317
4,11,11	311	10	323	2,10,2	317
4,23,9f.	242			2,14,3f.	352
4,23,10	243	Irenaeus		2,14,4	353
5,1,2-2,8	374	<i>Haer.</i>		2,22,2	374
5,1,5	375	1, <i>praef.</i> 2	330, 337	2,22,3	330
5,1,16	375	1, <i>praef.</i> 3	311, 332, 367	2,22,5	338, 347, 360
5,1,57	375	1,1-8	309	2,22,6	339
5,4,1f.	362, 367	1,1	316	2,24,4	338
5,20,4-6	34	1,1,1	321	2,26,1	313
5,24	364	1,2	316	2,27	317
5,24,13	364	1,2,2	330	2,28,9	330
5,24,18	364	1,3,1	317, 318	2,33,2	353
6,19,7	233	1,3,6	317	2,33,3	354
<i>Theoph.</i> 2,44	177	1,4,4	316	3,1,1	340
		1,4,5	320	3,3,1-3	359
<i>Herm.</i>		1,7,2	323	3,3,3	339
<i>Vis.</i> 2,4,3	243	1,8	317	3,3,4	345
<i>Vis.</i> 3,9,2	45	1,8,1	315, 317, 319	3,4,2f.	361
<i>Vis.</i> 3,9,4	45	1,8,2	318, 323f.	3,5,3	325
<i>Mand.</i> 10,2	303	1,8,5	323	3,8,3	218
<i>Sim.</i> 9,12,1-3	325	1,9	309	3,10,1	340
		1,9,2f.	324	3,11,3	323
Hieronymus, <i>Vir. ill.</i>		1,9,2	315, 316	3,11,8	318
13	74	1,9,3	316	3,12,13	375
15	360	1,9,4	310, 315, 316	3,14,1	330
		1,9,5	309	3,14,2	345
Hippolytus		1,10	309ff., 323	3,15,2	334
<i>Antichr.</i>		1,10,1	316	3,16,5	345
1	50, 52	1,10,3	306-335,	3,17,4	337
29	49		308, 320,	3,18,5	374
<i>Haer.</i>			321, 323,	3,19,1	326
1,1f.	216		328-330,	3,20,1	322
1,1,3	216		333, 334f.	3,20,2	320, 322
1,19	167, 180, 351	1,11f.	309	3,23,1	320
1,19,1f.	353	1,11,1	309, 318	3,24,1	200
5,6,4	330	1,13-17	309	3,24,2	316
		1,13,3	337	3,25,2	167
Ignatius		1,13,6	313	3,25,5	170, 200, 351,
<i>Eph.</i>		1,15,6	338		356
<i>praef.</i>	216	1,18-20	309	4	322
2,1	295	1,18,1	311, 318	4, <i>praef.</i> 2	309, 338
14,1	167, 215	1,21,5-22,1	309	4, <i>praef.</i> 3	345
14,2	216, 232	1,21,5	311	4,3,1	372
<i>Magn.</i>		1,22f.	309	4,5,1	320
2,1	295	1,22	309	4,20,4-11	321

4,20,4	324	5,33,4	325, 343	Papias, fr. 3	4
4,20,12	327	5,35,1	325		
4,25,1	324, 325	5,35,2	372	<i>Pre. Pet.</i> fr. 2	321
4,26,5	341	5,36,1-3	344		
4,27-32	341	5,36,1	325	<i>Prot. Jas.</i>	
4,27	340	5,36,2	341	14,1	13
4,27,1	340, 341,	<i>Epid.</i>		23,3	13
	343, 347	3	344		
4,30	367	16	320	Tatianus, <i>Oratio ad Graecos</i>	
4,30,2f.	368	61	344	4	217
4,30,3	365, 369f.	93-94	327, 328	7,1-2	62
4,30,4	342				
4,31,1	340, 369,	Justinus, <i>Apol.</i>		Tertullianus	
	372	1,53,3	328	<i>An.</i> 56,6	338
4,32,1	322, 340f.	1,53,6	328	<i>Marc.</i>	
4,33,3	334	1,66,1	50	2,20	367
4,33,9	375	1,66,3	50	4,24	367
4,37,7	320	1,68,2	330	5,13	367
4,38,1	324	2,5,3f.	320, 322		
4,41,2	341			Tübingen Theosophy	
5, <i>prae</i> f.	364	Ps.-Justinus, <i>Cohortatio ad</i>		10	195
5,3,2	326	<i>Graecos</i>		40	194
5,5,1	341	6	353	61-65	197
5,6,1	318	15	175	64	196
5,13	326	20	175		
5,13,3	326	22	175		
5,16,2f.	324	25	167, 174	4. Pagan Writings	
5,17,4	326, 341	32	175		
5,23,1f.	320			Aelianus,	
5,24	370	<i>Mart. Pol.</i>		<i>Nat. an.</i> 11,40	348
5,24,1	371	3	330		
5,24,2	371, 372	12,2	330	Aelius Aristides	
5,24,3	371			<i>Ars rhetorica</i> 1,5	283
5,25,1	372	Methodius, <i>Res.</i> 2,10,5		<i>Discourse to Zeus</i>	
5,25,3	372	175		30	205
5,26,1	372			31	206
5,26,2	373	Minucius Felix, <i>Oct.</i>		<i>Discourse on</i>	
5,27ff.	325	18,7	218	<i>Serapis</i> 21	206
5,29,1	373	21,11	218	<i>Or.</i>	
5,29,2	319			26,100	366
5,30	325, 373	Origenes		42	275,
5,30,1	201, 342,	<i>Cels.</i> 6,15	181		279-281,
	347	<i>Comm. Jo.</i>			288, 296
5,30,2	342	1,209	233	44	275,
5,30,3	347, 373	1,219f.	233		278-282,
5,31,1	325	1,221	233		288,
5,32	344	1,222-225	234		298f.
5,33,1	347	1,224	234		
5,33,3	342	6,54,279	359f.	Aetius 4,19,1	134

Albinus, <i>Epit.</i>		<i>Div.</i> 1,132	102	1,90,2	131
8,2	353	<i>Fat.</i> 2	273	4,1,7	50
10,3f.	188	<i>Nat. d.</i> 2,32	357	5,67,2	50
12,1	353	<i>Off.</i> 3,102	267	5,71,1	60
12,2	357	<i>Tusc.</i> 1,79	357	5,71,6	60
13,3	357			13,48,4	24
		<i>Corp. herm.</i>		13,48,7	24
Alcmaeon fr. 2	198	4,8	218	13,48,8	24
		16	53	13,72,1	24
Andocides,		16,19	218	13,90,6	96
<i>De mysteriis</i> 109	296			14,8,3	50
		Cornutus, <i>Nat. d.</i> 28	227	14,32,4	24
Appianus, <i>Hist. rom.</i> 1, <i>praef.</i>				14,105,4	152
7	366	Demosthenes		16,7,2	273
		<i>Cor.</i> 18,161	23	19,2,8	50
Apuleius		<i>Lept.</i> 504	59	20,35,2	24
<i>De mundo</i>		<i>Philip.</i>		20,90,3	24
37	191	3,18	23	21,17,2	96
38	178	3,56	23	34 fr. 1	146
<i>Dogm. Plat.</i>		<i>Symm.</i> 14,34	23		
1,5	188, 353			Diogenes Laertius	
2	199	Dio Cassius		1,36	216
<i>Metam.</i> 2,12–14	102	44,23ff.	272	8,22	362
		44,23,3	280		
Aristoteles		44,25,3f.	272	Diogenianus fr. 3	152
<i>Cael.</i>		44,25,3	303		
268a	197	73,18,3	348	Dionysius Halicarnassus	
283b	217			<i>Ant. rom.</i>	
<i>Eth. nic.</i> 1106	98	Dio Chrysostomus, <i>Or.</i>	2,18		163
<i>Probl.</i> 916a	198	7,82f.	49	2,24,1	163
<i>Rhet.</i>		38,1ff.	279	3,7,7	40
1,3	282f.	38,3	280	3,9,1	40
1,4	283	38,4f.	50	3,21,7	40
		38,4	50, 281	3,49,4	24
Ps.-Aristoteles, <i>De mundo</i>		38,5	50	4,23,2–4	50
1 (391a)	49	38,6	281, 293	5,7,4	348
6 (399b)	188	38,10	290	5,10,1	40
7 (401a–b)	177,	38,48f.	303	6,19,1	40
	191–193	39,2	61, 271	6,25,1	40
		40,26	271	6,30,3	40
Atticus		41,9	49	6,39,1	40
fr. 3	180, 356	48,6	281	6,42,1	40
fr. 4	355	48,13	294	6,57,1	40
		48,14	291	6,67,1	40
Chrysippus	49	49,6	270	6,95,2	96
				7,8,1	40
Cicero		Diodorus Siculus		7,34,1	40
<i>Att.</i> 9,9,2	291	1,39	349	7,36,4	40
<i>De or.</i> 1,56	291	1,70,6	59	7,60,2	273f., 280

8,4,2	40	<i>Od.</i> 6,182ff.	278	<i>Orphica</i>	
10,3,1	293			<i>Hymni</i>	
11,1,3	348	Isocrates		<i>prooem.</i>	209
11,39,7	24	<i>Ep.</i> 3,2	279	4,1f.	208
<i>Comp.</i> 18	199	<i>Paneg.</i> 3	279	4,3-5	208
<i>Rhet.</i> 10,14	289	<i>Phil.</i> 16	279	34,14f.	205
<i>Thuc.</i>		<i>Soph.</i> 13	50	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
5	95			13	195
6	349	Jamblichus		21	191, 195
8	95	<i>De vita Pythagorica</i>		21a	178, 191,
16	96	9,45	280		192
50	304	37	361	23	193
		<i>Protrepticus</i> 4	198	61	197
<i>Dissoi Logoi</i> 6,13	200	<i>Theologoumena</i>		159	193
		<i>arithmetica</i>	199, 218	168	192, 195
Ecphantus	257, 283				
		Joannes Lydus		Pausanias, <i>Descr.</i>	
Epictetus, <i>Diatr.</i>		<i>De mensibus</i> 2,8	197	4,31,5	349
3,13,9	366				
4,1,62	152	Livius 4,7,1	274	Philodemus, <i>Rhet.</i>	
4,1,68	152			4,41	304
4,5,35	274	Longus, <i>Daphn.</i>			
		2,3,2	348	Philostratus	
Heraclitus				<i>Vit. Apoll.</i> 5,33	146
fr. 92	175	Lucianus		<i>Vit. soph.</i> 1,9,4	279
fr. 103	198	<i>Hermot.</i> 22	272		
		<i>Hist. conscr.</i> 47	97, 348	Pindarus, fr. 213	356
Herodianus		<i>Rhet. praec.</i> 15	200		
1,2,5	348			Plato	
7,7,2	152	Lysias, <i>Or.</i>		<i>Ep.</i>	
		25,3	50	2 (312e)	171
Herodotus		31,30	59		176
2,161f.	22			<i>Euthyphr.</i> 14e	132
4,11ff.	145	Ps.-Lysias, <i>Or.</i> 2	62	<i>Leg.</i>	
4,114	145			715a	50
4,134	145	Macrobius, <i>In Somnium</i>		715c-716a	193, 204
4,145	50	<i>Scipionis</i> 1,6,7	218	715eff.	229
7,102	22			715e-716	173, 181
7,150	50	Marcus Aurelius		715e-716c	168ff.
8,34	22	4,23	211	715e-716b	176
8,72,2f.	23	5,32,2	211	715e-716a	177, 178,
		6,30	53		191, 194,
Hesiodus,					220f.,
<i>Theog.</i> 34	226	Martianus			351, 356
		Capella 7	198	715e	172, 174,
Hippocrates,					183, 220,
<i>Decent.</i> 4	200	Melissus			224
		fr. 2	216	716a	173
Homerus		fr. 4	216	716c-d	172
<i>Il.</i> 9,97	214				

<i>Leg. (cont.)</i>		Ps.-Plutarchus,		Suetonius, <i>Otho</i>	
716c	172	<i>Stromata</i> 11	217	8,1	272
730c	178			15	273
<i>Meno</i> 99e	175	Polybius		Tacitus	
<i>Phaed.</i>		6,57	150	<i>Ann.</i> 1,1	98
67c	191	12,25	97	<i>Hist.</i>	
69c	191	15,36,9	349	3,80,4	272
70c	191	29,27,4	51	5,5	146
78a	171	30,7,5	23	Theognis	
78d	171	30,7,9	23	1,3f.	220
<i>Phileb.</i> 16c	350	30,30,3	24	1,1146	226
<i>Symp.</i>		38,8,1	51		
202e	132			Theon Smyrnaeus	197
218b	195	Porphyrius, <i>Abst.</i> 4,22	132		
<i>Resp.</i>				Theophrastus, <i>Physicorum</i>	
365b	356	Proclus, <i>Theologia</i>		<i>opiniones</i> fr. 5	203
620e–621a	354	<i>Platonica</i> 6,8	192		
<i>Tim.</i>				Thucydides	
27d–28a	175	Quintilianus, <i>Inst.</i>		1,7,34	40
27d	177	3,3,14	282	1,22,2	348f.
27e–28a	174	3,8,6	282	2,3,35	40
29e–30a	356, 357,	3,8,10	289	2,3,50	40
	358	3,8,14	283	2,4,18	40
29e	170, 180,	3,8,22	283	3,5,16	40
	351	3,8,26	283	3,68,3	23
31a	176	3,8,39f.	283	5,84,1	23
		3,8,66	289	6,3,10	40
Plutarchus				6,51,2	23
<i>Adv. Col.</i> 30,4	178	Sallustius,			
<i>Alex. fort.</i> 1,9	271	<i>Hist.</i> 1,77,13	273		
<i>Arat.</i> 24,2	226			Vergilius	
<i>Brut.</i> 44,1	226	<i>Scholia Arati</i> 5,1	134	<i>Aen.</i> 1,278f.	370
<i>Comm. not.</i> 31	188, 192			<i>Buc.</i> 8,75	198
<i>Def. orac.</i> 48	192	Servius	198,	<i>Georg.</i> 4,221f.	178
<i>E Delph.</i> 19	188	338			
<i>Exil.</i> 5	179			Vettius Valens	
<i>Garr.</i> 17	271	Sextus Empiricus,		4,11,172	52
<i>Oth.</i> 15	273	<i>Math.</i> 3,3	315	7,5,301	52
<i>Phil.</i> 1,4	226				
<i>Princ. iner.</i> 5	179	Sophocles, <i>Ant.</i>		<i>Vita Aesopi</i> 121f.	348
<i>Pyth. orac.</i>		1055	81		
17	204			Xenophon	
28	366	Stobaeus, <i>Ecl.</i>		<i>Anab.</i> 4,5,6	49
<i>Praec. ger.</i>		1,6,16	198	<i>Cyr.</i> 1,6,20	59
<i>rei publ.</i> 32	256, 294,	4,7,64	257	<i>Hell.</i>	
	301, 303			6,3,14	23
<i>Stoic. rep.</i> 38	188	Strabo, <i>Geogr.</i>		7,4,40	23
<i>Superst.</i> 4	271	11,6,3	349	7,5,5	23
		12,8,7	118		

<i>Mem.</i>		<i>IG</i> 12/5, 722	300	<i>PGM</i> 4, r. 1639–1642	207
3,4,8	59	<i>IG</i> 12/5, 906	256	<i>PGM</i> 4, 2449	212
4,3,13f.	175	<i>IG</i> 12/7, 15	300	<i>PGM</i> 4, 2785–2870	211
<i>Oec.</i> 9,14	59	<i>LMagnesia</i> 101	300	<i>PGM</i> 4, 2826ff.	210
		<i>LPriene</i> 8	300	<i>PGM</i> 13, 130	209
		<i>LPriene</i> 53–54	299	<i>SIG</i> 1125	202
		<i>LPriene</i> 53	299		
		<i>LPriene</i> 61	299		
5. Papyri & Inscriptions					
<i>IG</i> 7, 21	300	<i>PGM</i> 4, 1125f.	209f.		
<i>IG</i> 11/4, 1052	300	<i>PGM</i> 4, 1145ff.	210		

Index of Subjects

a. Greek words

ἀγάπη 262
ἀόργητος 267 *see also* God—Wrath
ἀπόρρητον 80, 85 *see also* Secret knowledge
ἀπροσδεής 133 *see also* God—Offerings
ἄφθονία 355 *see also* God—Wrath
ἄφθόνως 79–80 *see also* Secret knowledge
εὐσέβεια 132, 140n10, 213, 224, 246, 266, 268, 283n102
κήρυγμα 47, 51, 310–311, 319, 335, 339n10, 359 *see also* Proclamation
μεταμέλεσθαι 6–7
μετανοεῖν 6, 150
στάσις 34, 116–117, 148, 150n45, 253n34, 261, 273, 276–277, 294, 303n141, 305
συμβουλή 276–288
ταπεινοφροσύνη 181
φρονεῖν 17–27
χαρίσματα 47, 54–55

b. Subjects

Afterlife

Immortality 326
Resurrection 16, 258, 326, 329
Transferral to paradise (Enoch and Elijah) 341

Allegorical interpretation (rejection of)

117[Josephus], 325[Irenaeus]

Almsgiving *see* Charity

Antichrist 201, 325, 372–373, 375

Authorities (Roman) 34–35, 57–65, 112, 242n11, 255–256, 269, 363–376

Belief *see* Faith

Benevolence *see* Charity

Blood (innocent) 4, 7, 9–15

Canon (New Testament) 242, 350n47

Catalogue of vices 261

Charity 44–45, 51, 55, 59n12, 131–132, 135, 170n48

Christian assembly

Reading 245, 250–251

Christian community

Jewish and Gentile bodies of believers

241, 325, 332

see also 1 Clement—Church

Church *see* Christian community

1 Clement

Authorship 243

Church

Early Catholicism 241, 243

Gentile Christianity 241

see also Christian community

Clement's function 243

Date 242, 247

Dionysius of Corinth (letter of) 242n13, 243

Domitian 242n11

Genre 239–305

Epistle/treatise 247, 252

Homily/sermon 246–247, 289

Letter 252

Sumboulē *see* συμβουλή

Presbyters 244–245, 269, 277, 288, 293

Purpose/intention 250, 253, 302

Rhetorical aspects 284n103, 285, 288–290

2 Clement 243n17, 304, 328

Corpus Hellenisticum xi, 21n15, 57, 63, 65, 71, 73, 122–123, 125

Emperor *see* Authorities (Roman)

Empire *see* Authorities (Roman)

Eschatology 311, 325, 332, 342–343, 373

Essenes 115, 123–124, 184n83, 190

Exegesis (New Testament) 4–7, 69–73, 115, 121–125

Faith 6, 32n7, 215–216, 231–232, 258, 309–315, 330, 333, 344, 364–365

Regula fidei (Irenaeus) 309–315, 330–333

Form criticism 252, 264n61

Gnosticism 70, 170–171, 207–208, 222, 227n203, 306, 308–324, 328, 330–334,

- 338, 344, 347, 349, 352, 355, 358–359,
365, 369n14, 371, 374–375 *see also*
Irenaeus—Adversaries
- God
Offerings 132–135 *see also* ἀπροσδεής
Providence 113, 141n16, 180, 356–357
Seeing God 321
Wrath 149, 267 *see also* ὀργήτος,
ἀφθονία
- Hellenization
of Christianity 125–128, 243, 290, 355
of Judaism 76–77, 88, 114, 116, 119,
123–128, 136, 223
- Idolatry 11, 39, 141–144, 146, 147n35, 149, 154,
159, 163–165, 174, 224, 328
- Irenaeus
Adversaries
Docetists 374
Gnostics *see* Gnosticism
Marcion 320, 322, 346, 351, 355, 361,
367, 369n14, 374
Valentinians 308–309, 322, 339,
344–346, 349
Covenants
Adam, Noah, Moses, Jesus 321
Old and New (Law and Gospel) 322
Jesus' age 339
Presbyters as 'eyewitnesses' through the
apostles 340, 345, 347
Israel 13, 34, 108, 142–144, 148, 157, 165, 330,
368
- Jerusalem
Fall 112, 142, 158, 164, 365
Jerusalem above (the
church) 327[Irenaeus]
Jerusalem on earth (under Mosaic Law)
327[Irenaeus]
New Jerusalem 158, 160, 228, 328n65
- Josephus
Apologist 118, 138, 158, 165, 189
Aramaic language 126 *see also* Greek
language
Christian literature 116–117
Classical literature 106, 118, 183–184, 191,
193
David 129–130
Flavian dynasty 88, 99–103, 126, 158
Greek language 85, 92, 126 *see also*
Aramaic language
Josephus compared to Philo 76, 118, 126,
135–136, 140, 142, 154–157
Moses 149–153, 165n32
Testimonium Flavianum 76
Theocracy 186–189
- Judaism
Apostasy 154–157
Intermarriage with gentiles 137–157
Jews accused of atheism 164
Kashrut (dietary laws) 144, 147, 156
Orthopraxis versus orthodoxy 127
Judgement 57–58, 64, 158, 160, 171, 178,
258–259, 284, 286, 301, 310, 314, 324, 357,
370–371, 375
- Kingdom of God 27, 34, 344, 375
- Law (of Moses) 85, 95, 108, 127, 147, 149,
151–157, 172, 327
Logos 230–231, 323–324
- Martyrdom *see* Persecutions
Mission 47, 53, 128
Monotheism versus polytheism 63, 144,
146–147, 156–159, 175–176, 181, 183, 351n2
Mysteries *see* Secret knowledge
Mysticism 161, 202, 210, 226
- Nag Hammadi *see* Gnosticism
- Orphic Hymns 205, 207–209, 212, 222
Orphic literature 166–167, 169, 174–175, 178,
183–185n89, 191–197, 201, 219, 223–224
- Papias 325, 343
Parousia 324–325
Persecutions 242n11, 286n109, 302, 374–375
Philanthropy *see* Charity
Philosophical thought 136 and
188[Josephus], 267n72
Epicureanism 111[Josephus]
Platonism 189[Middle Platonism], 201,
204[Middle Platonism]
Metempsychosis (Irenaeus) 353–355
Plato's concept of God (Irenaeus) 171,
351, 357–358

Philosophical thought

Platonism (*cont.*)

- Plato's dependence on Moses' teachings ("theft of the Greeks") 172[Clement of Alexandria], 174–175[Ps.-Justin]

Pythagoreanism

- Clement of Alexandria 231n211
- Josephus 124n108, 190, 198, 201, 224
- Philo 213–214, 222

Stoicism 134, 210–211, 274

Polytheism *see* Monotheism versus polytheism

Prayer 32, 129–137, 253–255, 263, 270, 275, 303–304

- Petition for the empire / emperor (1 Clement) 255

Proclamation 32, 47, 51, 310–311, 312, 319, 325, 331 *see also* κήρυγμα

Prophecy 99–114, 117, 327

Qumran 70–71, 75, 115, 118, 124n108, 162, 184

Salvation 36, 50, 52, 277, 286n109, 318, 325–332, 358

Satan 17, 27, 371–372, 375

Secret knowledge 50–53, 55, 80, 113, 124, 186, 330–332 *see also* ἀπόρρητον, ἀφθόνωςState *see* Authorities (Roman)Synagogue 33, 136, 255, 328
Reading of Scripture 86, 153

Synagogue prayer 255, 268

Synoptic problem 121–122

Topos 40n21, 91–92, 133, 291nn16, 292

Translation

Dynamic Equivalence Translation 41–43

Trinitarianism 278n91[1 Clement], 310 and 331[Irenaeus]

Two Ways 169